

DUE DATE SLIP**GOVT. COLLEGE, LIBRARY**

KOTA (Raj)

Students can retain library books only for two
weeks at the most

BORROWER'S No	DUE DATE	SIGNATURE

REPORT
OF THE COMMITTEE OF DIRECTION

VOLUME I

THE SURVEY REPORT

PART 2 (CREDIT AGENCIES)

ALL-INDIA RURAL CREDIT SURVEY

REPORT
OF THE COMMITTEE OF DIRECTION

VOLUME I
THE SURVEY REPORT
PART 2 (CREDIT AGENCIES)



BOMBAY

1957

CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER 18	Credit Agencies
18 1	Relative importance of various credit agencies 1
18 2	Borrowings and debt of cultivators in the different districts 9
18 3	Inter State and regional variations in the importance of various credit agencies cultivators 23
18 4	Borrowings and debt of non cultivators in the different districts 29
18 5	Inter State and regional variations in the importance of various credit agencies non cultivators 43
CHAPTER 19	Government Finance
19 1	Structure and administration of Government finance 61
19 2	The role of the State as a credit agency 78
19 3	Loan operations and working 122
19 4	Concluding observations 180
CHAPTER 20	Co operative Finance
20 1	Structure of the Co operative Movement 183
20 2	Primary co operative credit societies 219
20 3	Central financing agencies 271
20 4	Land mortgage banking institutions 318
20 5	Co operative marketing societies 334
20 6	Relation of co operatives with other agencies 356
20 7	Role of co operatives 368
CHAPTER 21	Private Credit Agencies
21 1	Legal structure 403
21 2	Classification of private credit agencies 419
21 3	Relatives 424
21 4	Landlords 425
21 5	Village and urban moneylenders and indigenous bankers 455

CHAPTER 18

CREDIT AGENCIES

18 1 RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF VARIOUS CREDIT AGENCIES

18 1 1 We attempt in this and the following chapters an assessment of the role of various agencies supplying credit in rural areas to cultivators and non cultivators. The agencies which supply credit have been classified by us into nine classes viz, Government co operatives relatives landlords agriculturist moneylenders professional moneylenders traders and commission agents commercial banks and others. All borrowings from Government through various departments and under various schemes such as the Grow More Food campaign and schemes for the rehabilitation of displaced persons the Land Improvement Loans Act and the Agriculturists' Loans Act, have been accounted as from 'Government'. Borrowings from different types of co operative institutions such as primary credit societies marketing societies, central co operative banks and land mortgage banks were treated as borrowings from co operatives. Only interest free loans given by relatives were treated as loans from relatives, loans bearing interest from a relative were classified as from one or the other of the appropriate agency such as the agriculturist moneylender professional moneylender, etc, according to the business of the relative. Loans were classified as loans from landlords only when the loans were made by landlords to their own tenants. If a cultivator received a loan from a landlord of whom he was not a tenant, then such a loan was not recorded as from a landlord but under the appropriate agency according to the business of the landlord. An agriculturist money lender was defined as one whose major profession is agriculture and whose money lending business is comparatively of minor importance. The category of professional moneylenders was defined to include all those who earned a substantial part of their income from moneylending and who could not be classified as agriculturist money lenders. No distinction was made between professional moneylenders living in towns and those living in the rural area. Borrowings from persons who were in the main, traders, commission agents etc were treated as borrowings from 'traders and commission agents', referred to hereafter as 'traders'. Borrowings from all banks, scheduled and non scheduled including the Imperial Bank of India, were classified as borrowings from commercial banks. Borrowings from agencies other than those mentioned above were classified as borrowings from 'others'.

18 1 2 The average amount borrowed by a cultivating family during the year covered by the General Schedule was Rs 210, the corresponding average for non cultivating families was Rs 66. The average debt per cultivating family at the end of the General Schedule year was Rs 364 and the corresponding average in the

case of non-cultivator was Rs. 12.9. The distribution of borrowings as well as of outstanding debt according to type of creditor is shown in table 18.1. It will be seen from the table that of the total amount borrowed by cultivators only 3.3 per cent was from Government, 3.1 per cent from co-operative and 10.9 per cent from commercial banks. Landlord and trader were also not important credit agencies; the borrowings from them formed only 1.5 per cent and 5.5 per cent respectively of the total borrowing of cultivator. Relative supplied 14.2 per cent of the credit obtained by cultivator. By far the most important credit agencies were the agriculturist and professional moneylenders who advanced 24.9 per cent and 41.5 per cent respectively of the total amount borrowed by cultivator.

18.1.3 Borrowings from Government formed only 1.5 per cent of the total borrowing of non-cultivators. Another 1.5 per cent of the total amount borrowed by non-cultivators was from co-operatives. Commercial banks supplied 2.0 per cent of the credit obtained by non-cultivators while borrowings from relatives formed 15.5 per cent, those from landlord 4.9 per cent and those from traders 9.9 per cent of the total borrowings of non-cultivator. As in the case of cultivator agriculturist moneylenders and professional moneylenders between them advanced the bulk of the credit to non-cultivators. 74.8 per cent of the borrowing were from the former and 35.0 per cent from the latter. As compared to cultivators non-cultivators reported proportionately less borrowings from Government co-operatives and professional moneylenders and more from landlord, trader and commercial banks.

18.1.4 The patterns of distribution of the outstanding debt of cultivators and non-cultivators are broadly similar. About 25 per cent of the debt was due to agriculturist moneylenders, about 45 per cent to professional moneylender and roughly 12 per cent to relatives in both the cases. The debt due to Government formed 3.9 per cent of the total debt in the case of cultivator compared to 2.5 per cent in the case of non-cultivators. Cultivators owed to co-operatives and commercial banks together 3.7 per cent of their total outstanding debt; the corresponding proportion for non-cultivators was 2.3 per cent. The debt owed to landlord and traders formed 3.2 per cent and 4.7 per cent respectively of the total debt of cultivators and 5.0 per cent and 7.1 per cent respectively of the total debt of non-cultivators. The role played by Government and the co-operatives in rural finance was on the average negligible. The bulk of the credit was supplied by the moneylenders—professional and agriculturist—and as much as about 70 per cent of the rural debt was owed to them. The agriculturist moneylender as a credit agency was second in importance only to his professional counterpart.

18.1.5 Comparing the magnitude of borrowing during the year with the debt outstanding at the end of the year it is observed that unlike in the case of some credit agencies such as traders, the volume of debt owed to Government and landlords was far greater than the volume of borrowing during the year. The relevant data are given in the table on page 4.

TABLE 18 I—AVERAGE BORROWINGS FROM AND DEBT OWED TO DIFFERENT CREDIT AGENCIES BY CULTIVATORS NON-CULTIVATORS AND ALL FAMILIES

[Amount in rupees per family]

Credit agency	Borrowings					
	Cultivators		Non-cultivators		All families	
	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Government	6.9	3.3	1.0	1.0	4.9	3.1
Co-operative	6.5	3.1	1.0	1.5	4.6	2.9
Refrigerators	9.8	14.0	10.3	1.5	23.0	14.4
Landlords	3.0	1.5	3	4.9	3.0	2.0
Apartment moneylenders	5.1	21.9	16.4	21.8	9.7	4.8
Professional moneylenders	94.0	44.8	5.1	35.0	0.1	43.8
Traders and commission agents	11.5	5.5	6.5	9.9	9.8	6.1
Commercial banks	2.0	0.9	1.3	2.0	1.8	1.1
Other agencies	3.5	1.8	1.3	1.9	2.8	1.8
Total	209.5	100.0	66.1	100.0	159.9	100.0

Credit agency	Total amount of debt					
	Cultivators		Non-cultivators		All families	
	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage
	7	8	9	10	11	12
Government	14.1	3	3.7	2.8	10.5	3.7
Co-operatives and commercial banks	13.5	3.7	3.0	3	9.9	3.5
Plants	41.6	11.4	1	11.8	32.4	11.5
Landlords	11.5	3.2	6.4	5.0	5.8	3.5
Agricultural moneylenders	91.6	5.2	33.0	25.5	71.3	25.2
Professional moneylenders	1	46.8	57.5	44.5	131.1	46.4
Traders and commission agents	17.0	4.7	9.3	7.1	14.4	5.1
Other agencies	4.1	1.1	1.3	1.0	3.1	1.1
Total	313.7	100.0	129.4	100.0	282.5	100.0

10 tenants only 2 separate data on debt owed to co-operatives and commercial banks as a not a whole

	Government	Co-operatives and commercial banks	Landlords	Traders and commission agents
Average borrowings per cultivating family (Rs)	6.9	8.5	3.0	11.5
Average debt owed per cultivating family (R)	14.1	13.5	11.5	17.0

Whereas the debt owed to traders and to co-operatives and commercial banks was much less than twice the borrowings from them during the year in respect of Government and landlords the volume of debt owed was more than twice the volume of borrowings. As will be seen in the subsequent discussion loans from Government and landlords were generally for long term purposes while those from co-operatives and commercial banks were for short term purposes this difference might explain materially the variation in the borrowing-debt ratio.

18.1.6 The foregoing discussion is based on the total borrowings and debt. Some credit agencies especially Government and co-operatives usually give loans only for certain defined purposes the role of different agencies in different types of loans may therefore differ widely. We have no information regarding the terms and conditions of individual loans granted by the various agencies. The data available in this connexion relate to the reported purposes of borrowing. These data were classified according to each credit agency only for the selected cultivating families covered in the intensive enquiry. The loans borrowed by these families during the period covered by the intensive enquiry and outstanding at the time of the second round of visits were classified into eight broad categories with reference to the purpose of borrowing. These categories include short term and long term under each of the three purposes namely agricultural non agricultural and consumption purposes the remaining two purposes are repayment of old debts and other purposes. In this context long term agricultural purposes include medium term agricultural purposes also.

18.1.7 It is obvious that any classification of this type is subject to many limitations and that not all reported loans under a purpose could necessarily fit in one category. However it was thought necessary to adopt some classification for convenience of handling the data and the classification adopted by us is detailed below. Purchase of seed manure and fodder payment of wages and other purposes of current farm expenditure were grouped together under the category of short term agricultural purposes while loans for bunding and other land improvements digging and repair of wells purchase of livestock reclamation of land and such other capital expenditure purposes were classified under long term agricultural purposes. With respect to borrowings on consumption account loans for purchase of household utensils furniture clothing shoes bedding etc medical and educational expenses other occasional expenditure and other family expenses were classified under short term consumption group and those for construction and

repairs of residential houses and other buildings death and marriage ceremonies and litigation expenses were grouped under the category of long term consumption finance. Detailed classification of purposes into different types of finance is given below.

Purpose of borrowing

1. Agricultural

Short term	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interest free Interest free Purchase of seeds Payment of wages Payment of land revenue cess and other charges Payment of rent Maintenance of irrigation resources (excluding repairs to wells) Repairs and maintenance of implements etc. Other farm expenses
Long term	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purchase of land Reclamation of land Building and other land improvements Digging and repair of wells Development of other irrigation resources Laying of new orchards and plantations Purchase of livestock Purchase of implements machinery and transport equipment Construction of farm houses barns cattle sheds etc. Other capital investments in agriculture

2. Non agricultural

Short term	Non farm business expenditure on current account
Long term	Non farm business expenditure on capital account

3. Consumption

Short term	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purchase of household utensils furniture etc. Medical expenses Educational expenses Purchase of clothing shoes bedding etc. Other occasional expenditure Other family expenses
Long term	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction and repairs of residential houses and other buildings Death ceremonies Marriage and other ceremonies Litigation charges

4. Repayment of old debts

5. Other expenses

18.1.8 Table 18.2 gives the classification of borrowings from each credit agency according to these eight categories. Government supplied 6.0 per cent of the total credit obtained for long term agricultural purposes while co-operatives supplied 11.3 per cent of the total credit for short term agricultural purposes. The co-operatives lent 8.7 per cent of the total credit for repayment of old debts. Although only 11.8 per cent of the total finance was obtained from relatives, 13.1 per cent of the total borrowings for long term agricultural purposes and 15.2 per cent of the total borrowings for long term consumption purposes were obtained from them. Landlords who supplied only 2.2 per cent of the total credit contributed 2.8 per cent of the credit for long term agricultural purposes. Traders from whom 8.5 per cent of the total borrowings of the selected cultivators was obtained supplied 10.1 per cent of the finance for short term agricultural purposes, 15.6 per cent of

TABLE 182—AVERAGE BORROWINGS OF CULTIVATORS CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO PURPOSE AND CREDIT AGENCY

[Intensive enquiry data. Amount in rupees per family]

Credit agency	Total		PURPOSE							
			Agricultural				Non Agricultural			
	Amount	Percentage	Short term		Long term		Short term		Long term	
			Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Government	5.2	2.7	0.7	2.5	3.1	6.0	-	-	-	0.6
Co-operatives	6.2	3.2	2.8	11.3	1.2	2.4	-	0.9	-	-
Relatives	22.4	11.8	1.9	7.5	6.7	13.1	-	1.4	0.5	7.1
Landlords ¹	4.2	2.2	0.5	2.1	1.4	2.5	-	1.5	-	-
Agriculturist moneylenders	63.3	33.2	8.4	34.1	19.9	35.7	0.6	2.2	0.4	6.2
Professional moneylenders	61.8	32.4	6.2	25.1	12.0	23.3	0.5	2.9	5.6	41.1
Traders and commission agents	16.3	8.5	2.5	10.1	4.4	8.6	0.3	1.6	0.1	1.7
Commercial banks	1.0	0.5	0.4	1.7	0.2	0.5	-	1.8	-	0.1
Others	10.6	5.5	1.3	5.3	2.4	4.6	0.7	3.8	-	6.2
Total	191.0	100.0	24.8	100.0	51.3	100.0	2.2	100.0	6.6	100.0

Credit agency	PURPOSE							
	Consumption				Repayment of old debts		Others	
	Short term		Long term		Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage
	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage				
	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Government	0.8	2.1	0.4	1.0	-	0.5	0.2	0.5
Co-operatives	0.8	2.2	0.4	0.9	0.4	5.7	0.6	2.4
Relatives	5.3	14.6	6.3	15.2	0.5	10.6	1.2	9.2
Landlords ¹	0.9	2.1	0.9	9.2	0.1	2.0	0.4	1.8
Agriculturist moneylenders	11.1	50.6	15.1	35.9	2.5	50.4	5.4	23.2
Professional moneylenders	11.9	50.9	13.6	32.9	0.9	10.6	12.2	51.6
Traders and commission agents	4.6	12.6	1.8	4.3	0.6	12.6	2.0	5.3
Commercial banks	0.2	0.6	0.1	0.1	-	0.2	-	-
Others	1.5	4.3	2.9	6.9	0.2	4.1	1.6	6.7
Total	35.2	100.0	41.4	100.0	4.9	100.0	21.6	100.0

¹ To tenants only

the finance for short term non agricultural purposes and 12.6 per cent of the finance for short term consumption purposes. They made available 12.6 per cent of the total finance for repayment of old debts. Commercial banks from which only 0.5 per cent of the total credit was obtained supplied 1.8 per cent of the credit for non agricultural short term purposes and 1.7 per cent of that for short term agricultural purposes.

18.1.3 There is a marked difference between the General Schedule and the intensive enquiry data as regards the role of the agriculturist and the professional moneylenders. Whereas the proportion of borrowings from agriculturist moneylenders to the total borrowings of cultivators was 24.9 per cent according to the General Schedule it was 33.2 per cent according to the intensive enquiry. Professional moneylenders supplied 14.8 per cent of the total credit obtained by cultivators according to the General Schedule data while their contribution to the total credit according to the intensive enquiry was only 32.4 per cent. Though only 32.4 per cent of the total borrowings of selected cultivators was from professional moneylenders 84.1 per cent of the borrowings for long term non agricultural purposes and 51.6 per cent of the borrowings for other purposes were from this agency. Of the total credit obtained for long term agricultural purposes 38.7 per cent was from agriculturist moneylenders. The agriculturist moneylenders supplied 50.4 per cent of the total credit for repayment of old debts.

18.1.10 In table 18.3 we give the proportion of debt incurred for each purpose from Government and co-operatives to the total debt incurred by the selected cultivators for the purpose. It will be noted that 7.4 per cent of the total debt incurred for short term agricultural purposes was owed to co-operatives and that 5.1 per cent of the debt incurred for the purpose was owed to Government. As regards long term agricultural purposes 9.4 per cent of the total debt incurred for the purpose was owed to Government whereas only 2.5 per cent was owed to co-operatives. Nearly 13 per cent of the debt contracted for repayment of old debts was owed to co-operatives. These data also emphasize the very small role played by Government and co-operatives in rural finance. Government's role was somewhat significant only in the case of loans for short term and long term agricultural purposes and the role of co-operatives only in loans for short term agricultural purposes and for repayment of old debts.

18.1.11 We shall now consider the relative importance of the different credit agencies in relation to various classes of cultivators viz. the big, large, medium and small cultivators. In table 18.4 we give the average borrowings as well as the proportion of borrowings of various classes of cultivators from each credit agency based on the General Schedule data. Whereas 4.5 per cent of the borrowings of the big cultivators and 3.8 per cent of the borrowings of the large cultivators were from Government only 3.2 per cent of the borrowings of the medium cultivators was from this agency. The average borrowing of the big and the large cultivators from Government was Rs 21.0 and Rs 13.5 respectively per family and it was only Rs 5.6 per

TABLE 18.3—AVERAGE DEBT OWED BY CULTIVATORS CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO PURPOSE AND CREDIT AGENCY

[Intensive enquiry data Amount in rupees per family Figures in brackets denote percentages to total debt]

Purpose	Total		CREDIT AGENCY		
	Amount	Percentage	Government	Co-operatives and commercial banks ¹	Others
	1	2	3	4	5
AGRICULTURAL					
Short term	28.9	9.1	1.5 (5.1)	2.1 (7.4)	25.3 (87.5)
Long term	79.8	25.3	7.5 (9.4)	2.0 (2.5)	70.3 (88.1)
NON AGRICULTURAL					
Short term	2.7	0.9	— ()	— (0.1)	2.7 (99.5)
Long term	6.3	2.0	— (0.7)	— (0.3)	6.3 (99.0)
CONSUMPTION					
Short term	67.8	21.5	1.3 (1.9)	1.2 (1.7)	65.3 (96.4)
Long term	68.6	21.7	0.7 (1.0)	0.5 (0.7)	67.4 (98.3)
Repayment of old debts	12.6	4.0	0.1 (1.0)	1.6 (12.5)	10.9 (86.2)
Others	49.1	15.5	0.5 (1.1)	0.7 (1.3)	47.9 (97.6)
Total	315.8	100.0	11.7 (3.7)	8.0 (2.5)	296.1 (93.8)

¹ Separate data on debt owed to co-operatives and commercial banks are not available**TABLE 18.4—AVERAGE BORROWINGS AMONG THE FOUR CLASSES OF CULTIVATORS CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY**
[Amount in rupees per family]

Credit agency	BIG CULTIVATORS		LARGE CULTIVATORS		MEDIUM CULTIVATORS		SMALL CULTIVATORS	
	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Government	24.0	4.5	13.5	3.8	5.6	3.2	2.3	2.0
Co-operatives	21.0	4.0	13.5	3.8	4.7	2.7	1.9	1.7
Relatives	73.9	14.0	51.8	14.5	24.3	14.1	15.0	13.5
Landlords ¹	3.7	0.7	4.0	1.1	3.1	1.8	2.5	2.2
Agriculturist money lenders	106.5	23.9	86.3	24.2	44.8	25.9	27.6	24.8
Professional moneylenders	221.8	41.9	154.4	43.3	77.8	45.0	55.1	49.6
Traders and commission agents	40.3	7.6	22.4	6.3	8.5	4.9	4.6	4.1
Commercial banks	10.1	1.9	5.1	1.4	0.8	0.5	0.4	0.4
Others	7.7	1.5	5.6	1.6	3.3	1.9	1.9	1.7
Total	529.0	100.0	356.6	100.0	172.9	100.0	111.3	100.0

¹ To tenants only

family in the case of the medium cultivators. The average borrowing from Government was Rs 2.3 and the proportion of borrowings from Government to the total borrowings was 2.0 per cent in the case of the small cultivators. Similarly whereas the average borrowing from co-operatives in the case of the big and the large cultivators was Rs 21.0 and Rs 13.5 respectively per family it was only Rs 4.7 per family in the case of the medium cultivators. The proportion of borrowings from the agency to the total borrowings was 4.0 per cent and 3.8 per cent respectively in the case of the big and the large cultivators and 2.7 per cent in the case of the medium cultivators. As regards the small cultivators the average borrowing from co-operatives was Rs 1.9 which formed 1.7 per cent of their total borrowings. Both Government and the co-operatives thus supplied relatively larger proportion of the credit obtained by the large cultivators and particularly the big cultivators. In the case of traders and commercial banks also the trend of a decline in their relative importance as we move from the big to the small cultivator is noted. The proportion of borrowings from relatives to the total borrowings from all agencies was 14.0 per cent in the case of the big cultivators and 13.5 per cent in the case of the small cultivators, and no consistent trend is apparent in the variation of the proportion of borrowings from the agency. The proportion of borrowings from agriculturist moneylenders to the total borrowings also does not show any consistent trend. Landlords supplied 2.2 per cent of the total credit obtained by the small cultivators whereas only 0.7 per cent of the borrowings of the big cultivators was from this agency. This perhaps reflects the greater prevalence of tenancy arrangements among the smaller cultivators. Professional moneylenders were also relatively more important for the smaller cultivators.

18.2 BORROWINGS AND DEBT OF CULTIVATORS IN THE DIFFERENT DISTRICTS

18.2.1 In table 18.5 district wise data on the average borrowings of cultivators from various credit agencies are given. The proportion of borrowings from each credit agency to the total borrowings is also given in the table. Out of the 75 selected districts borrowings from Government were reported in 67 districts. In ten of these districts 10 per cent or more of the total borrowings were from Government. In four out of these ten districts viz Tripura, Hoshiarpur, Shivpur and Sagar as much as 40.9 per cent, 31.8 per cent, 23.5 per cent and 23.2 per cent of the total borrowings respectively were from Government. The high percentage in Tripura is largely due to the reporting in one village where all the 15 cultivating families obtained loans from Government. In 27 districts the proportion of borrowings from Government to the total borrowings was more than 1 per cent but less than 10 per cent. In the remaining 30 districts borrowings from Government formed only less than 1 per cent of the total borrowings.

18.2.2 In 62 out of the 75 selected districts varying amounts were reported to have been borrowed during the year from co-operatives. In only 12 districts, however, did borrowings from co-operatives constitute more than 5 per cent of the total borrowings. In 26 districts the proportion of borrowings from co-operatives

TABLE 18.5—AVERAGE BORROWINGS PER CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY

[Amount in rupees Figures in brackets denote percentages to total borrowings]

State/District	Total borrowings	Government	Co-operatives	Relatives	Land lords ¹	Agriculturist money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Commercial banks	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Assam										
Lakhimpur	95	— (—)	— (—)	36 (37.8)	— (—)	16 (16.7)	43 (45.1)	— (—)	— (—)	— (0.4)
Cachar	100	8 (8.3)	2 (1.8)	62 (62.2)	— (—)	24 (24.5)	— (0.5)	— (—)	— (—)	3 (2.7)
Kamrup	145	10 (6.6)	— (—)	106 (72.9)	— (0.3)	22 (15.1)	3 (2.2)	2 (1.5)	— (—)	2 (1.3)
Tripura										
Tripura	136	56 (40.9)	— (—)	34 (24.9)	— (—)	15 (11.3)	23 (17.2)	5 (3.3)	— (0.1)	3 (2.3)
West Bengal										
Jalpaiguri	87	1 (1.1)	— (0.3)	34 (38.4)	39 (44.7)	— (0.3)	12 (13.3)	1 (1.5)	— (—)	— (0.4)
Malda	155	2 (0.9)	1 (0.9)	56 (36.0)	1 (0.8)	— (—)	95 (61.2)	— (0.1)	— (—)	— (0.1)
Burdwan	140	6 (4.4)	2 (1.6)	44 (31.4)	— (—)	12 (8.2)	76 (53.9)	— (0.3)	— (—)	— (0.2)
Midnapore	118	1 (0.7)	2 (1.6)	36 (30.7)	— (—)	— (—)	79 (66.4)	1 (0.5)	— (—)	— (0.1)
Bihar										
Bhagalpur	277	11 (4.1)	1 (0.2)	6 (2.2)	— (—)	48 (17.5)	211 (75.9)	— (—)	— (—)	— (0.1)
Monghyr . .	230	10 (4.5)	— (0.1)	17 (7.3)	20 (8.8)	— (—)	182 (79.1)	— (—)	— (—)	1 (0.2)
Hazaribagh	60	6 (9.2)	— (—)	4 (6.8)	— (0.1)	14 (23.7)	35 (58.6)	— (—)	— (—)	1 (1.6)
Palamau . .	126	1 (1.1)	— (—)	1 (1.1)	— (—)	— (—)	124 (97.8)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)
Uttar Pradesh										
Muzaffarpur	135	21 (15.3)	4 (2.9)	3 (2.5)	1 (0.5)	80 (59.4)	12 (8.7)	14 (10.3)	— (—)	— (—)
Ballia . .	120	2 (2.0)	1 (1.0)	18 (14.7)	— (0.3)	41 (34.2)	53 (44.0)	4 (3.1)	— (—)	1 (0.7)
Deoria . .	288	— (0.1)	15 (5.3)	6 (2.1)	4 (1.4)	76 (26.3)	181 (62.7)	— (—)	— (0.1)	6 (2.0)
Jaunpur . .	179	1 (0.4)	2 (1.1)	38 (21.3)	— (0.1)	95 (52.9)	35 (19.5)	3 (1.9)	— (—)	5 (2.5)
Sultanpur . .	94	— (—)	— (0.3)	31 (33.0)	— (—)	6 (6.4)	22 (23.3)	6 (6.7)	— (—)	28 (30.3)
Sitapur	44	— (—)	2 (4.0)	34 (76.8)	— (0.1)	— (—)	8 (18.9)	— (0.1)	— (—)	— (0.1)
Kanpur	213	— (—)	— (0.1)	98 (46.2)	10 (4.5)	10 (4.9)	91 (42.9)	3 (1.2)	— (—)	1 (0.2)

¹ To tenants only

TABLE 185—AVERAGE BORROWINGS PER CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY—Continued

[Amount in rupees Figures in brackets denote percentages to total borrowings]

State/District	Total borrowings	Government	Co-operative	Relatives	Landlords	Agricultural money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Commercial banks	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Uttar Pradesh										
—Concld										
Hamirpur	157	(0.2)	2	25	20	1	109	()	()	(0.3)
Shahjahanpur	272	(0.6)	3	17	(13.0)	8	237	8	()	()
Agia	302	(0.5)	2	3	(0.9)	12	291	(2.9)	()	2
Aligarh	206	()	4	34	(0.2)	(3.9)	165	(0.1)	()	(0.5)
Amritsar	258	(1.5)	4	25	()	(0.1)	208	(0.9)	()	(0.3)
		(1.5)	(1.4)	(3.9)	(2.4)	()	(80.7)	(0.1)	(3.7)	(0.4)]
Meerut	335	(0.1)	3	113	()	159	11	47	()	()
		(0.1)	(0.9)	(33.6)	(0.5)	(47.4)	(3.3)	(14.2)	()	()
Himachal Pradesh										
Simla	109	1	2	44	13	13	17	11	3	5
		(0.8)	(2.1)	(40.5)	(12.2)	(11.9)	(15.5)	(9.6)	(0.7)	(4.7)
Punjab										
Hoshiarpur	277	88	12	147	6	()	94	()	()	()
		(31.8)	(4.2)	(52.9)	(2.4)	()	(3.7)	()	()	()
Jullundur	254	6	23	148	7	()	70	()	()	()
		(2.5)	(3.0)	(58.0)	(0.5)	()	(7.7)	()	()	()
Risear	138	1	()	41	7	2	87	()	(0.1)	(0.1)
		(0.4)	(0.3)	(29.4)	(4.9)	(1.7)	(63.1)	()	(0.1)	(0.1)
PEPSU										
Bhatinda	436	()	()	60	2	212	115	19	3	1
		(0.4)	()	(14.2)	(5.1)	(49.6)	(26.4)	(4.3)	(0.8)	(0.2)
Mohandergarh	409	()	()	91	1	306	19	1	()	2
		()	()	(5.0)	(0.0)	(89.6)	(4.4)	(0.2)	()	(0.6)
Rajasthan										
Churu	146	()	()	14	1	()	81	()	()	49
		()	()	(9.8)	(0.7)	()	(55.9)	()	()	(33.6)
Banmer	268	1	()	83	()	()	184	()	()	()
		(0.3)	()	(30.9)	()	()	(68.8)	()	()	()
Sirohi	30	(0.2)	()	2	2	()	25	()	()	(0.3)
		(0.2)	()	(6.7)	(5.3)	()	(87.5)	()	()	()
Jaipur	359	()	()	31	(8.7)	()	327	()	()	1
		()	()	(8.7)	(0.1)	()	(90.9)	()	()	(0.3)
Sawai Madhopur	337	7	()	19	3	()	306	(0.1)	()	9
		(2.0)	()	(5.7)	(0.8)	()	(90.8)	(0.1)	()	(0.6)
Chittorgarh	210	(0.2)	()	25	2	()	170	5	()	2
		(0.2)	()	(11.8)	(0.9)	()	(83.9)	(2.1)	()	(1.1)

1 To tenants only

TABLE 18.5—AVERAGE BORROWINGS PER CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY—Continued

[Amount in rupees. Figures in brackets denote percentages to total borrowings]

State/District	Total borrowings	Government	Co-operatives	Relatives	Land lords ¹	Agriculturist money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Commercial banks	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Madhya Bharat										
Jhabua	122	12 (9.7)	2 (1.7)	2 (1.4)	— (—)	2 (1.4)	100 (52.0)	— (—)	— (0.2)	4 (3.6)
Shivpuri	92	22 (23.5)	1 (1.0)	— (0.1)	— (0.3)	— (—)	68 (73.9)	— (—)	1 (1.2)	— (—)
Shajapur	358	3 (0.8)	16 (4.5)	9 (2.4)	4 (1.2)	8 (2.2)	314 (87.5)	4 (1.0)	— (—)	— (0.1)
Bhilai	387	49 (12.6)	— (—)	20 (5.1)	6 (1.6)	— (—)	291 (75.1)	— (—)	8 (2.1)	13 (3.5)
Bhopal										
Raisen	163	1 (0.8)	— (—)	29 (17.9)	88 (53.8)	— (—)	41 (25.2)	1 (0.3)	— (—)	3 (2.0)
Vindhya Pradesh										
Satna	72	— (0.1)	— (0.1)	1 (0.8)	1 (1.7)	62 (86.0)	5 (7.7)	1 (0.9)	— (—)	2 (2.8)
Rewa	116	2 (1.6)	— (—)	1 (0.7)	1 (1.0)	31 (26.7)	79 (67.7)	— (0.3)	2 (1.9)	— (0.1)
Orissa										
Sambalpur	75	1 (0.7)	— (—)	4 (5.7)	— (0.1)	12 (15.9)	58 (77.4)	— (—)	— (—)	— (0.2)
Puri	115	2 (1.5)	5 (4.4)	10 (8.6)	— (0.1)	— (—)	96 (83.3)	— (0.5)	— (0.1)	2 (1.5)
Koraput	47	— (—)	1 (1.0)	2 (4.4)	— (—)	— (—)	44 (94.6)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)
Madhya Pradesh										
Bilaspur	84	1 (0.9)	7 (8.7)	12 (14.4)	— (—)	36 (42.7)	26 (30.8)	— (—)	— (—)	2 (2.5)
Durg	64	7 (10.0)	1 (1.4)	4 (6.7)	— (—)	35 (54.9)	17 (26.8)	— (—)	— (—)	— (0.2)
Chanda	174	13 (7.4)	1 (0.4)	43 (25.0)	3 (1.7)	— (0.1)	104 (59.6)	6 (3.5)	3 (1.6)	1 (0.7)
Nagpur	195	13 (6.7)	10 (5.2)	47 (23.9)	2 (1.2)	— (—)	86 (44.0)	21 (10.9)	— (—)	16 (8.1)
Sagar	514	119 (23.2)	7 (1.3)	34 (6.7)	— (—)	7 (1.3)	339 (65.9)	— (—)	— (—)	8 (1.6)
Akola	162	1 (0.6)	10 (6.6)	20 (12.3)	7 (4.3)	42 (25.6)	69 (42.3)	10 (6.0)	2 (1.5)	1 (0.9)
Saurashtra										
Sorath	238	13 (5.5)	— (—)	27 (11.1)	— (—)	— (—)	173 (72.5)	24 (10.2)	1 (0.6)	— (—)
Bombay										
Ahmedabad	370	37 (10.0)	22 (6.0)	122 (33.0)	5 (1.3)	— (—)	125 (33.9)	54 (14.6)	— (—)	5 (1.2)
Broach	304	2 (0.5)	96 (31.6)	80 (26.1)	10 (3.3)	— (—)	35 (11.4)	44 (14.4)	— (—)	39 (12.7)

¹ To tenants only.

TABLE 18.5—AVERAGE BORROWINGS PER CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY—Concluded

[Amount in rupees Figures in brackets denote percentages to total borrowings]

State/District	Total borrowings	Government	Co-operative	Relatives	Land lords ¹	Agri-cultu-rist money-lenders	Profes-sional money-lenders	Traders and commission agents	Commercial banks	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Bombay—Concd										
West Khandesh	266	9 (3.3)	56 (21.0)	73 (27.5)	~ (~)	40 (15.0)	40 (17.3)	17 (6.6)	25 (9.3)	()
Poona	193	22 (11.4)	3 (2.0)	31 (16.0)	1 (0.5)	9 (4.6)	53 (27.4)	19 (9.6)	5 (2.8)	14 (7.3)
Ratnagiri	39	1 (1.3)	4 (9.5)	11 (28.0)	(0.8)	(1.5)	18 (45.7)	2 (6.2)	1 (2.8)	2 (4.2)
Kolhapur	99	(0.3)	21 (21.4)	18 (18.4)	1 (0.7)	(0.3)	51 (51.9)	6 (5.7)	1 (1.3)	~ ()
Bijapur	204	1 (0.5)	11 (5.5)	39 (19.2)	~ (0.1)	126 (61.8)	7 (3.2)	20 (9.6)	~ (0.1)	()
Hyderabad										
Omanabad	207	4 (2.1)	1 (0.6)	52 (24.9)	1 (0.4)	112 (54.0)	14 (6.9)	20 (9.5)	~ ()	3 (1.6)
Parbhani	161	3 (1.6)	1 (0.8)	24 (14.7)	23 (14.2)	11 (6.8)	65 (40.4)	32 (20.0)	~ ()	2 (1.5)
Nizamabad	175	3 (1.9)	5 (3.1)	7 (3.9)	1 (0.3)	15 (37.0)	52 (29.9)	38 (21.6)	~ (-)	4 (2.3)
Mahabubnagar	270	5 (1.9)	1 (0.2)	5 (2.0)	1 (0.4)	18 (6.7)	36 (37.6)	3 (1.2)	()	()
Mysore										
Hassan	185	~ (-)	~ (0.2)	2 (0.9)	1 (0.6)	164 (88.1)	()	22 (11.7)	6 (3.5)	~ ()
Bangalore	221	~ ()	~ (-)	16 (7.3)	3 (1.2)	169 (75.9)	24 (11.0)	1 (0.6)	~ ()	9 (4.0)
Madras										
Coimbatore	495	2 (0.4)	18 (3.7)	10 (2.0)	4 (0.9)	221 (44.6)	191 (39.0)	3 (0.6)	44 (8.8)	2 (0.5)
Cuddalore	439	12 (2.6)	7 (1.6)	1 (0.3)	~ ()	271 (61.9)	145 (33.1)	~ (-)	2 (0.3)	1 (0.2)
Kurnool	476	1 (0.2)	18 (3.9)	8 (1.4)	1 (0.2)	313 (65.6)	101 (21.2)	32 (6.7)	2 (0.4)	2 (0.4)
West Godavari	578	12 (2.1)	18 (3.1)	12 (2.0)	1 (0.2)	355 (61.5)	121 (20.9)	48 (8.1)	9 (1.5)	3 (0.5)
Chingleput	312	36 (11.7)	2 (0.5)	23 (7.5)	4 (1.4)	148 (47.2)	90 (28.7)	4 (1.2)	5 (1.7)	5 (0.1)
Ramanathapuram	154	19 (6.6)	1 (0.7)	2 (0.8)	~ (-)	134 (87.2)	2 (1.2)	5 (3.4)	~ (-)	~ (-)
Malabar	406	~ (0.1)	3 (0.7)	12 (2.8)	~ (0.1)	102 (25.0)	33 (8.2)	232 (57.2)	2 (0.6)	22 (5.4)
Travancore-Cochin										
Quilon	278	~ ()	13 (4.6)	61 (21.8)	3 (1.1)	~ (-)	94 (33.7)	81 (29.2)	18 (6.6)	8 (3.1)

¹ To tenants only

to the total borrowings varied from 1 to 5 per cent. Thus, it would appear that the relative importance of the credit agency, while generally low, varied considerably from district to district. This is as could be expected, the extent of development of the Co-operative Movement varies widely from State to State. The following table presents, for some districts, data relating to borrowings of cultivators, relevant in this context.

State District	Borrowings from co-operatives as percentage of total borrowings	Average amount borrowed from co-operatives per family	Proportion of families borrowing from co-operatives to the total number of families
		(Rs)	(Per cent)
Punjab			
Hoshiarpur	4.2	12	4.2
Jullundur	9.0	23	10.2
Hissar	0.3	-	0.1
Madhya Bharat			
Jhabua	1.7	2	2.2
Shivpuri	1.0	1	0.4
Shajapur	4.5	16	7.3
Blasia	-	-	-
Madhya Pradesh			
Bilaspur	8.7	7	1.9
Durg	1.4	1	1.7
Chanda	0.4	1	0.7
Nagpur	5.2	10	5.0
Sagar	1.3	7	4.1
Akola	6.6	10	7.8
Bombay			
Ahmedabad	6.0	22	4.3
Ratnagiri	31.6	96	21.2
	21.0	56	13.1
	20.4	39	7.1
	9.5	4	1.8
Kolhapur	21.4	21	14.9
Bijapur	0.5	11	4.9
Madras			
Coimbatore	3.7	18	4.6
Cuddapah	1.6	7	3.6
Kurnool	3.9	18	3.3
West Godavari	3.1	18	10.0
Chingleput	0.5	2	0.5
Ramanathapuram	0.7	1	0.5
Malabar	0.7	3	1.4

These data show that not only does the extent of development of the Co-operative Movement vary from State to State but also that there is considerable variation in the extent of development within the States. Whereas in Broach the average amount borrowed per family from co-operatives was Rs 96, it was only Rs 4 in Ratnagiri. The data further indicate that for a proper comparative study of the role of co-operatives, both the average borrowings and the proportion of borrowings from the agency to the total borrowings are of importance. For instance, whereas in Ratnagiri although the average borrowing from co-operatives was only Rs 4 per

family, the amount borrowed from co-operatives was 9.5 per cent of the total amount borrowed in West Godavari where only 3.1 per cent of the total borrowings were from co-operatives, borrowings from the agency averaged Rs 18 per family

18.2.3 Borrowings from commercial banks were reported by cultivators in 31 of the selected districts but in only 3 districts viz West Khandesh Coimbatore and Quilon more than 5 per cent of the total borrowings were from this agency. Of the 16 districts where more than 1 per cent of the total borrowings were from commercial banks 9 are in Bombay Madras Mysore and Travancore Cochin. Among the remaining seven districts only one district viz Nainital is in Uttar Pradesh. In none of the selected districts of Assam West Bengal Bihar Rajasthan and Hyderabad were borrowings from commercial banks reported by cultivators.

18.2.4 Borrowings from relatives were reported in all the 75 districts. In 26 out of the 75 districts more than 20 per cent of the total borrowings were from relatives. In five districts viz Sitapur Kamrup Cachar Jullundur and Hoshiarpur more than 50 per cent of the total borrowings were from relatives. In 21 districts borrowings from relatives constituted between 20 and 50 per cent of the total borrowings. In 36 districts less than 10 per cent of the borrowings were from relatives. All borrowings from relatives recorded in our schedules were free of interest. The following table sets out the relative importance of the different credit agencies in the five districts in which more than 50 per cent of the total borrowings were from relatives.

District	BORROWINGS FROM THE AGENCY AS PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL BORROWINGS								
	Government	Co-operatives	Relatives	Landlords (to tenants only)	Agriculturist money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Commercial banks	Others
1. Sitapur	—	4.0	76.9	0.1	—	18.9	0.1	—	0.1
2. Kamrup	6.6	—	72.9	0.3	15.1	2.2	1.5	—	1.3
3. Cachar	8.3	1.8	62.2	—	24.6	0.6	—	—	2.7
4. Jullundur	2.5	9.0	58.0	2.8	—	27.7	—	—	—
5. Hoshiarpur	31.8	4.2	52.9	2.4	—	8.7	—	—	—

Whereas in Jullundur and Sitapur the borrowings from professional moneylenders were 27.7 per cent and 18.9 per cent of the total borrowings respectively in the other three districts only less than 10 per cent of the total borrowings were from that agency. In two of these districts viz, Kamrup and Cachar next to relatives, agriculturist moneylenders played the most important part and in the third viz Hoshiarpur, as already noted Government loans were of considerable importance.

18.2.5 Borrowings from landlords were reported in 63 out of the 75 districts, in 5 districts, viz, Raisen, Jalpaiguri Parbhani Hamirpur and Sirmoor these formed more than 10 per cent of the total borrowings. In Raisen and Jalpaiguri, the proportion was more than 40 per cent while in the other three it was less than

15 per cent The field staff had been specifically instructed to classify as loans from landlords only the loans advanced by landlords to their own tenants, borrowings from landlords of cultivators who were not their tenants were to be shown as from the appropriate credit agency, depending on the occupation of the landlord However due to wide variations in tenancy arrangements in different areas and in the meaning attached to words like zamindar it is not unlikely that the term was not correctly interpreted and the interpretation uniformly applied in all the districts

18.2.6 The relative importance of other credit agencies in the two districts where borrowings from landlords were proportionately very large is brought out in the following table

District	BORROWINGS FROM THE AGENCY AS PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL BORROWINGS								
	Government	Co-operatives	Relatives	Landlords (to tenants only)	Agriculturist moneylenders	Professional moneylenders	Traders and commission agents	Commercial banks	Others
1. Raichur	0.8	-	17.9	53.8		20.2	0.3	-	2.0
2. Jalpurgur	1.1	0.3	38.4	44.7	0.3	13.3	1.5	-	0.4

18.2.7 Borrowings from traders constituted more than 10 per cent of the total borrowings in 11 out of the 75 districts The proportion of borrowings from traders to the total borrowings was between 3 and 10 per cent in 16 districts, while in 9 districts it was between 1 and 3 per cent In 22 districts the proportion was less than 1 per cent In the three districts, viz., Malabar, Quilon and Hassan, where the proportion of borrowings from traders to the total borrowings was the highest, cultivation of and trade in spices and garden crops are very important Of the other districts in which finance from traders was relatively important, cotton and oilseeds are the most important commercial crops in Parbhani, Broach and Sorath In Sorath traders living in big marketing centres like Manavadar, Porbunder, Veraval etc., were reported to be advancing loans to cultivators, on the stipulation that the crop would be sold to them after harvest In Malabar, where the trader was the most important credit agency, the trader-cum shopkeeper-cum-moneylender was reported to be dominant in the rural credit structure

18.2.8 Borrowings from agriculturist moneylenders were reported in 55 of the selected districts, in 13 districts borrowings from agriculturist moneylenders formed more than 50 per cent of the total borrowings In 33 districts more than 10 per cent of the total borrowings were from agriculturist moneylenders The varying importance of professional moneylenders in the districts where more than 25 per cent of the total borrowings were from agriculturist moneylenders can be seen from the table on next page

18.2.9 In 33 out of the 75 districts more than 50 per cent of the total borrowings were from professional moneylenders In 19 districts the proportion of borrowings from this agency to the total borrowings was between 25 and 50 per cent In 11 districts the proportion was between 10 and 25 per cent, and in another 11

District	BORROWINGS FROM THE AGENCY AS PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL BORROWINGS	
	Agriculturist moneylenders	Professional moneylenders
1 Mohanlarkh	81.6	4.4
2 Ramabhatlajuram	87.2	1.2
3 Satna	86.0	7.7
4 Hassan	83.1	
5 Bangalro	75.3	11.0
6 Karmool	65.6	2.1
7 Chhailajh	61.9	33.1
8 Bhopal	61.8	3.2
9 West Chandavari	61.5	20.3
10 Mirzapur	59.4	8.7
11 Durg	51.9	26.8
12 Osmanabad	51.0	6.3
13 Jaunpur	52.9	19.8
14 Bhatnagar	48.6	26.4
15 Meerut	47.4	3.3
16 Chhargolput	47.2	28.7
17 Coimbatore	44.6	38.6
18 Bhopal	42.7	30.8
19 Nizamabad	37.0	29.9
20 Ballia	31.2	41.0
21 Rewa	26.7	67.7
22 Doria	26.4	62.7
23 Akola	25.6	43.3

districts it was less than 10 per cent of the total borrowings. In one district viz., Hassan the cultivators did not report any borrowing from professional moneylenders. Of the 18 districts where borrowings from professional moneylenders constituted more than 75 per cent of the total borrowings of cultivators only one viz. Mahbub nagar is from a State in the South. The rest are in Bihar, Orissa, Madhya Bharat, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh.

18.2.10. Of the 34 districts in which less than 40 per cent of the total borrowings were from professional moneylenders in 12 more than half the total credit was supplied by agriculturist moneylenders. There are six other districts in which more than 50 per cent of the total borrowings of cultivators was from the agriculturist moneylender and some other private credit agency, the contribution by the agriculturist moneylender being more than 35 per cent of the total borrowings. The table below gives the relevant details for these six districts.

District	DISTRIBUTION OF BORROWINGS FROM THE AGENCY TO THE TOTAL BORROWINGS (per cent)		
	Professional moneylenders	Agriculturist moneylenders	Other agency
1 Meerut	3.3	47.4	33.6 Relatives
2 Bhatnagar	26.4	48.6	14.2
3 Chhargolput	28.7	47.2	7.5
4 Coimbatore	38.6	44.6	8.8 Commercial banks
5 Bhopal	30.8	42.7	14.4 Relatives
6 Nizamabad	29.9	37.0	21.6 Traders

18 2 11 In five of the districts where professional moneylenders supplied less than 40 per cent of the total credit the major part of the total borrowings was from relatives, in three other districts viz, Sultanpur Sirmoor and Jalpaiguri, relatives supplied more than 30 per cent of the total credit and together with one or two other private agencies accounted for more than half the total credit supplied. Of the remaining eight districts where the professional moneylender was not dominant, in Tripura Government supplied 40.9 per cent of the total credit, while in Raipur and Malabar landlords and traders respectively supplied the major part of the total credit, in the other five districts the major part of the borrowings was from two or more credit agencies. The relative importance of the various credit agencies in the eight districts is set out in the table below.

BORROWINGS FROM THE AGENCY AS PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL BORROWINGS

District	Government	Co-operatives	Relatives	Landlords (to tenants only)	Agricultural money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Commercial banks	Others
1. Tripura	40.9	-	24.9	-	11.3	17.2	3.3	0.1	2.3
2. Raipur	0.8	-	17.9	23.8	-	25.2	0.3	-	2.0
3. Ahmedabad	10.0	0.0	33.0	1.3	-	33.9	11.6	-	1.2
4. Braich	0.2	31.6	26.1	3.3	-	11.4	11.4	-	12.7
5. West Khandesh	3.3	21.0	27.5	-	12.0	17.3	6.6	9.3	-
6. Poona	11.4	20.4	16.0	0.5	4.6	27.4	9.6	2.8	7.3
7. Malabar	0.1	0.7	2.8	0.1	25.0	8.2	27.2	0.6	2.4
8. Quilon	-	4.6	21.8	1.1	-	33.7	29.2	6.6	3.1

18 2 12 In table 18 6 we gave the data on debt owed to each credit agency and the proportion it forms to the total debt, for cultivators of the selected districts. It will be seen from the table that in all districts except Tripura and Sagar, where 54 per cent and 36 per cent of the total debt respectively was owed to Government less than 20 per cent of the debt was owed to this agency. In four districts, viz., Kamrup, Burdwan, Hoshiarpur and Ahmedabad, 15 to 20 per cent of the total debt was owed to Government while in seven districts, viz., Sambalpur, Murzapur, Chingleput, Shivpur, Nagpur, Poona and West Khandesh, the corresponding proportion was between 10 and 15 per cent. In 12 districts, 5 to 10 per cent of the total debt was owed to Government while in 16 districts the corresponding proportion ranged from 1 to 5 per cent. In 31 districts less than 1 per cent of the total debt was owed to Government and in 3 districts no debt was owed to Government. Separate data on debt owed to co-operatives are not available as the General Schedule made provision for collecting the data on debt owed to co-operatives and commercial banks together.

18 2 13 In 4 districts, viz., Cachar, Hoshiarpur, Kamrup and Sitapur, more than 50 per cent of the total debt was owed to relatives while in 13 other districts between 25 and 50 per cent of the total debt was owed to this agency. More than 25 per cent of the debt was owed to landlords in three districts, viz., Raipur, Jalpaiguri and Jullundur. In nine districts, between 10 and 25 per cent of the total debt was

**TABLE 18.6—AVERAGE DEBT PER CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED
ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY**

[Amount in rupees Figures in brackets denote percentages to total debt]

State/District	Total debt	Govern- ment	Co opera- tives and com- mer- cial banks ¹	Pola- tives	Land lords	Agricul- tural money lenders	Profes- sional money lenders	Traders and com- mission agents	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Assam									
Lakhimpur	92	— (—)	2 (2.2)	37 (40.0)	— (—)	12 (13.1)	41 (44.6)	— (—)	— (0.1)
Cachar	151	13 (8.6)	3 (1.7)	95 (62.9)	— (—)	38 (25.0)	1 (1.0)	— (—)	1 (0.6)
Kamrup	301	45 (15.0)	— (—)	173 (57.5)	1 (0.3)	39 (12.9)	23 (7.6)	15 (5.1)	5 (1.7)
Tripura									
Tripura	220	119 (53.9)	— (0.1)	33 (17.3)	3 (1.4)	24 (10.9)	29 (13.2)	5 (2.3)	3 (1.2)
West Bengal									
Jalpaiguri	83	1 (1.2)	— (0.4)	34 (41.4)	31 (37.7)	— (—)	16 (19.6)	— (0.3)	— (0.4)
Malda	144	5 (3.4)	— (0.3)	61 (42.4)	1 (0.8)	— (—)	75 (51.8)	2 (1.2)	— (0.1)
Burdwan	265	49 (18.4)	3 (1.0)	68 (25.6)	6 (2.4)	15 (5.8)	124 (46.6)	— (0.1)	— (0.1)
Midnapore	144	1 (0.8)	3 (1.9)	45 (31.4)	1 (0.6)	— (—)	94 (65.2)	— (0.2)	— (—)
Bihar									
Bhagalpur	427	13 (3.1)	5 (1.1)	3 (0.8)	— (—)	78 (18.2)	328 (76.8)	— (—)	— (—)
Monghyr	404	21 (5.1)	2 (0.5)	20 (4.9)	57 (14.0)	— (—)	334 (75.4)	— (—)	— (0.1)
Hazaribagh	102	5 (4.9)	1 (0.8)	7 (6.7)	— (0.1)	15 (14.5)	74 (72.3)	— (—)	— (0.3)
Palamau	200	1 (0.7)	1 (0.3)	7 (3.4)	1 (0.6)	— (—)	100 (95.0)	— (—)	— (—)
Uttar Pradesh									
Mirzapur	216	25 (11.5)	7 (3.1)	4 (1.8)	— (0.2)	120 (55.6)	30 (13.7)	26 (12.2)	4 (2.0)
Balke	306	3 (0.9)	1 (0.5)	27 (9.0)	7 (2.3)	331 (43.0)	124 (40.6)	11 (3.5)	1 (0.2)
Deoria	515	1 (0.2)	16 (3.2)	8 (1.4)	3 (0.7)	80 (16.8)	399 (77.2)	1 (0.1)	2 (0.4)
Jaunpur	282	— (0.1)	3 (1.0)	51 (18.1)	1 (0.2)	100 (59.9)	48 (17.0)	4 (1.3)	7 (2.4)
Sultanpur	158	1 (0.4)	1 (0.4)	33 (20.8)	1 (0.0)	9 (5.6)	75 (47.6)	5 (3.2)	33 (21.1)
Sitapur	62	— (0.1)	2 (4.0)	35 (56.3)	5 (8.6)	— (—)	19 (31.0)	— (—)	— (—)
Kanpur	254	— (0.1)	— (0.2)	106 (41.6)	13 (5.0)	11 (4.4)	119 (46.9)	4 (1.7)	— (0.1)

¹ Separate data on debt owed to co-operatives and commercial banks are not available

**TABLE 18 6—AVERAGE DEBT PER CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED
ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY—Continued**

[Amount in rupees. Figures in brackets denote percentages to total debt]

State District	Total debt	Government	Co-operatives and commercial banks ¹	Relatives	Land lords	Agricultural money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Uttar Pradesh—Contd.									
Hamirpur	278	—	4	22	44	1	207	—	—
		(—)	(1.3)	(8.1)	(15.8)	(0.2)	(74.4)	(0.1)	(0.1)
Shahjahanpur	258	—	35	15	1	9	196	7	—
		(—)	(13.6)	(5.8)	(0.2)	(3.5)	(75.1)	(2.9)	(0.1)
Agra	480	—	3	4	—	3	470	—	—
		(0.4)	(0.6)	(0.9)	(—)	(0.6)	(97.0)	(—)	(0.2)
Alwar	276	1	4	40	—	—	230	1	1
		(0.2)	(1.5)	(14.4)	(0.2)	(—)	(83.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)
Nainital	810	3	121	9	20	—	512	1	1
		(0.2)	(14.7)	(1.1)	(2.5)	(—)	(63.2)	(0.1)	(0.1)
Meerut	415	1	5	107	5	214	29	53	—
		(0.3)	(1.3)	(25.5)	(1.2)	(51.2)	(7.0)	(12.5)	(0.1)
Himachal Pradesh									
Sirmoor	221	—	7	57	31	20	85	11	3
		(—)	(3.4)	(25.9)	(14.2)	(11.5)	(38.3)	(4.9)	(1.5)
Punjab									
Hoshiarpur	349	50	10	200	38	—	35	—	—
		(14.5)	(4.5)	(57.5)	(10.9)	(—)	(10.0)	(—)	(0.1)
Jullundur	519	28	33	160	160	—	110	—	—
		(5.1)	(6.3)	(30.6)	(30.9)	(—)	(21.1)	(—)	(—)
Hissar	418	1	2	70	14	3	321	—	6
		(0.3)	(0.6)	(16.7)	(3.3)	(0.5)	(76.5)	(—)	(1.2)
PEPSU									
Bhatinda	1,363	5	8	104	223	657	241	17	7
		(0.4)	(0.6)	(7.6)	(16.3)	(48.2)	(17.7)	(1.3)	(0.2)
Mohinderwarh	866	—	1	3	1	237	94	1	1
		(—)	(0.1)	(0.3)	(0.1)	(27.4)	(10.5)	(0.1)	(0.2)
Rajasthan									
Churu	248	—	—	28	5	2	199	5	28
		(0.1)	(0.1)	(11.3)	(2.1)	(0.9)	(80.1)	(2.0)	(11.4)
Farmer	518	2	4	179	5	—	328	—	—
		(0.4)	(0.9)	(34.6)	(0.9)	(—)	(63.2)	(—)	(—)
Sirohi	329	—	5	6	7	—	220	—	90
		(—)	(1.6)	(1.8)	(2.2)	(—)	(66.9)	(—)	(27.4)
Jalpur	745	—	2	62	—	—	681	—	—
		(—)	(0.2)	(8.3)	(0.1)	(—)	(91.4)	(—)	(—)
Sawai Madhopur	636	3	4	42	6	—	577	—	3
		(0.2)	(0.6)	(6.6)	(1.0)	(—)	(90.5)	(—)	(0.5)
Chittorgarh	428	3	4	30	—	2	389	—	—
		(0.7)	(0.9)	(7.0)	(—)	(0.5)	(90.8)	(1.1)	(—)

¹ Separate data on debt owed to co-operatives and commercial banks are not available.

**TABLE 18 6—AVERAGE DEBT PER CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED
ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY—Continued**

[Amount in rupees Figures in brackets denote percentages to total debt]

State/District	Total debt	Government	Co operatives and com mercial banks ¹	Pea sants	Land lords	Agri cultural money lenders	Profes sional money lenders	Traders and com mission agents	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Madhya Bharat									
Jhabua	200	8 (4.1)	3 (1.7)	3 (1.6)	— (—)	— (0.2)	169 (79.3)	— (—)	26 (13.1)
Shivpuri	253	26 (10.3)	3 (1.3)	3 (1.1)	11 (4.5)	— (—)	209 (82.8)	— (—)	— (—)
Shajapur	367	7 (1.9)	30 (8.1)	11 (2.9)	4 (1.0)	8 (2.2)	305 (83.3)	2 (0.6)	— (—)
Bhilai	531	60 (9.5)	29 (5.4)	55 (10.3)	26 (4.9)	— (—)	358 (67.0)	— (—)	15 (2.9)
Bhopal									
Raisen	193	7 (3.8)	— (0.1)	33 (16.9)	92 (47.5)	— (—)	58 (30.4)	2 (1.2)	— (0.1)
Vindhya Pradesh									
Satna	77	— (0.1)	1 (1.6)	4 (4.8)	15 (19.3)	42 (55.0)	14 (17.7)	1 (0.9)	— (0.6)
Rewa	167	2 (1.3)	— (—)	2 (1.1)	4 (2.2)	26 (15.7)	132 (79.2)	1 (0.4)	— (0.1)
Orissa									
Sambalpur	94	11 (11.5)	— (0.4)	8 (8.8)	— (—)	20 (21.7)	54 (57.5)	— (—)	— (0.1)
Puri	156	3 (1.7)	7 (4.8)	17 (11.1)	4 (2.5)	— (0.1)	121 (77.7)	3 (2.1)	— (—)
Koraput	65	6 (8.6)	— (0.6)	2 (3.2)	— (—)	— (—)	56 (86.0)	1 (1.6)	— (—)
Madhya Pradesh									
Bilaspur	147	1 (0.6)	6 (4.2)	10 (6.9)	— (—)	46 (31.1)	84 (57.1)	— (—)	— (0.1)
Durg	79	0 (—)	3 (3.5)	4 (5.6)	— (—)	16 (19.6)	50 (63.3)	— (—)	— (—)
Chanda	281	23 (8.3)	19 (6.6)	53 (19.9)	5 (1.8)	— (—)	169 (60.0)	12 (4.4)	— (—)
Nagpur	247	37 (14.9)	15 (6.3)	62 (25.1)	4 (1.8)	— (0.1)	99 (40.0)	23 (9.3)	8 (2.5)
Sagar	568	207 (36.4)	8 (1.4)	35 (6.3)	— (—)	12 (2.0)	282 (53.2)	— (—)	4 (0.7)
Akola	190	2 (0.9)	11 (5.7)	22 (11.6)	23 (12.2)	7 (3.8)	111 (58.6)	12 (6.6)	1 (0.6)
Saurashtra									
Sorath	264	21 (8.1)	— (—)	29 (11.0)	— (—)	— (—)	204 (77.1)	10 (3.7)	— (0.1)
Bombay									
Ahmedabad	799	125 (15.6)	38 (4.8)	203 (25.4)	64 (8.0)	— (—)	219 (27.4)	143 (17.9)	7 (0.9)
Broach	556	64 (9.6)	99 (17.8)	110 (19.9)	57 (10.3)	— (—)	132 (23.8)	66 (11.8)	38 (6.8)

¹ Separate data on debt owed to co-operatives and commercial banks are not available

**TABLE 18.6—AVERAGE DEBT PER CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED
ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY—Concluded**

[Amount in rupees Figures in brackets denote percentages to total debt]

State/District	Total debt	Gov- ernment	Co- opera- tives and com- mer- cial banks ¹	Rela- tives	Land lords	Agri- cultu- rist money lenders	Protes- sional money lenders	Tran- sactions and com- mission agents	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Bombay—Concld									
West Khandesh	389	58 (14.8)	102 (26.3)	78 (20.2)	18 (4.6)	25 (6.4)	92 (23.6)	16 (4.0)	- (0.1)
Poona	432	55 (12.8)	72 (16.6)	65 (14.9)	1 (0.3)	- (-)	180 (41.7)	69 (13.7)	- (-)
Ratnaguri	188	6 (3.5)	25 (13.3)	61 (27.2)	14 (7.3)	- (-)	76 (40.4)	15 (7.9)	1 (0.4)
Kolhapur	197	- (0.2)	22 (11.0)	30 (15.4)	7 (3.4)	- (0.2)	131 (66.7)	6 (3.1)	- (-)
Bijapur	285	19 (6.5)	22 (7.7)	49 (17.1)	1 (0.3)	144 (50.7)	15 (5.3)	35 (12.4)	- (-)
Hyderabad									
Omanabad	305	5 (1.6)	2 (0.8)	75 (24.5)	1 (0.5)	164 (53.7)	26 (8.4)	29 (9.6)	3 (0.9)
Parbhani	155	1 (0.3)	2 (1.0)	24 (15.7)	23 (15.2)	7 (4.6)	78 (50.2)	20 (13.0)	- (-)
Nizamabad	295	18 (6.1)	18 (3.5)	8 (2.7)	- (0.2)	157 (36.2)	108 (36.1)	42 (13.5)	5 (1.7)
Mahbubnagar	365	8 (2.3)	3 (0.9)	8 (2.1)	- (0.1)	23 (6.4)	319 (87.3)	3 (0.9)	- (-)
Mysore									
Hassan	490	- (0.1)	10 (2.0)	2 (0.3)	3 (0.7)	440 (89.9)	- (0.1)	33 (6.7)	1 (0.2)
Bangalore	435	- (-)	- (0.1)	37 (8.6)	9 (2.0)	333 (77.7)	33 (7.7)	2 (0.5)	15 (3.4)
Madras									
Coimbatore	1,204	19 (1.6)	79 (6.6)	30 (2.5)	2 (0.2)	416 (34.5)	656 (54.4)	2 (0.1)	1 (0.1)
Cuddapah	795	13 (1.7)	14 (1.7)	8 (1.0)	2 (0.2)	536 (67.4)	219 (27.6)	- (-)	3 (0.4)
Kurnool	801	2 (0.2)	36 (4.5)	12 (1.5)	1 (0.2)	521 (65.0)	168 (21.0)	68 (7.2)	4 (0.4)
West Godavari	871	13 (1.5)	27 (3.1)	40 (4.6)	- (-)	527 (60.5)	204 (23.4)	57 (6.5)	3 (0.4)
Chingleput	548	57 (10.4)	30 (5.4)	34 (6.2)	5 (1.0)	211 (38.6)	209 (39.1)	2 (0.3)	- (-)
Ramanathapuram	680	11 (1.6)	10 (1.5)	3 (0.5)	- (-)	536 (78.9)	12 (1.7)	108 (15.8)	- (-)
Malabar	625	1 (0.1)	6 (1.0)	16 (2.6)	23 (3.7)	162 (25.9)	108 (17.3)	274 (43.8)	35 (5.6)
Travancore-Cochin									
Quilon...	303	- (-)	27 (8.8)	61 (20.1)	3 (1.2)	1 (0.2)	147 (48.4)	56 (18.4)	9 (2.9)

¹ Separate data on debt owed to co-operatives and commercial banks are not available

owed to this agency In 6 districts none of the cultivators was indebted to landlords while in 57 districts less than 10 per cent of the total debt was owed to the agency

18 2 14 Debt owed to traders accounted for 43 8 per cent of the total debt in Malabar In ten districts between 10 and 20 per cent of the total debt was owed to traders the proportion of debt owed to the agency being as high as 18 4 per cent in Quilon 17 9 per cent in Ahmedabad and 15 8 per cent in Ramanathapuram

18 2 15 More than 75 per cent of the total debt in four districts viz Hassan Mohindergarh Ramanathapuram and Bangalore was owed to agriculturist money lenders In nine districts between 50 and 75 per cent of the debt was owed to this agency while in eight others the corresponding proportion ranged from 25 to 50 per cent Thus the districts in which more than 50 per cent of the total debt was owed to agriculturist moneylenders numbered 13 As against this in 37 districts more than 50 per cent of the total debt was owed to professional moneylenders More than 90 per cent of the total debt in 4 districts between 75 and 90 per cent of that in 14 districts and between 50 and 75 per cent of that in 19 districts was owed to professional moneylenders

18 3 INTER STATE AND REGIONAL VARIATIONS IN THE IMPORTANCE OF VARIOUS CREDIT AGENCIES CULTIVATORS

18 3 1 In table 18 7 we give the average amount borrowed from each credit agency and the proportion it forms to the total borrowings in respect of cultivators in each State similar figures in respect of debt are given in table 18 8 The averages and percentages for a State from which only one district was investigated are the same as the corresponding figures for the district investigated from the State States from which only one district each was included in the Survey do not therefore figure in the tables and discussions the relevant data are already presented and their important characteristics brought out in the discussions on the district data

18 3 2 In the Punjab where about 15 per cent of the total borrowings were from Government and about 6 per cent of the debt was owed to Government finance for the rehabilitation of displaced persons was important In Assam about 6 per cent of the total borrowings were from Government and about 13 per cent of the debt was owed to Government In this State also rehabilitation finance was important In Madhya Pradesh where 17 0 per cent of the total debt was owed to Government Government was lending substantial amounts under the Grow More Food schemes the Land Improvement Loans Act and the Agriculturists Loans Act in Madhya Bharat where 8 7 per cent of the total borrowings were from Government large amounts were lent by Government under the Grow More Food schemes

18 3 3 Less than 5 per cent of the total borrowings were from co operatives in all the States except Bombay where 16 2 per cent of the total borrowings were from the agency In several of the States no borrowings at all or negligible proportions of the borrowings were reported from co operatives Even in Madras West Bengal and the Punjab co operatives supplied only a very small proportion of the total

TABLE 18.7—AVERAGE BORROWINGS PER CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY—STATE-WISE DATA

[Amount in rupees. Figures in brackets denote percentages to total borrowings.]

State	Total borrowings	Government	Co-operatives	Peasants	Land lords ¹	Agricultural money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Commercial banks	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
As am	122.3	7.6 (6.2)	0.6 (0.5)	80.3 (65.7)	— ()	91.5 (74.6)	9.2 (7.5)	1.0 (0.9)	— ()	2.0 (1.6)
West Bengal	124.7	2.2 (1.8)	1.7 (1.3)	40.0 (32.1)	4.0 (3.2)	2.6 (2.1)	73.5 (58.9)	0.7 (0.5)	— ()	— ()
Bihar	166.3	7.8 (4.7)	0.1 (0.1)	9.2 (5.5)	8.1 (4.9)	11.6 (7.0)	128.6 (77.4)	— ()	— ()	0.8 (0.5)
Uttar Pradesh	200.9	1.7 (0.9)	4.3 (2.2)	33.2 (16.5)	2.8 (1.4)	43.7 (21.7)	104.1 (51.9)	6.2 (3.1)	0.2 (0.1)	4.6 (2.3)
Punjab	207.8	30.3 (14.6)	8.8 (4.2)	98.1 (47.2)	6.7 (3.2)	0.9 (0.4)	62.9 (30.3)	— ()	0.1 ()	— ()
PEPSU	424.4	1.1 (0.3)	— ()	44.4 (10.5)	13.0 (3.1)	278.2 (65.5)	73.3 (17.3)	11.3 (2.7)	1.7 (0.4)	1.4 (0.3)
Rajasthan	277.8	1.8 (0.6)	— ()	29.2 (10.5)	1.3 (0.5)	— ()	238.4 (85.5)	1.0 (0.4)	— ()	6.1 (2.2)
Madhya Bharat	200.4	17.4 (8.7)	4.5 (2.3)	5.1 (2.5)	1.7 (0.8)	2.6 (1.3)	163.7 (81.7)	1.0 (0.5)	1.3 (0.7)	2.8 (1.4)
Vindhya Pradesh	97.1	1.1 (1.2)	— ()	1.0 (1.0)	1.0 (1.0)	44.3 (45.6)	47.2 (48.6)	0.4 (0.4)	1.1 (1.2)	0.9 (0.9)
Orissa	84.3	1.2 (1.4)	2.3 (2.7)	5.9 (7.0)	0.1 (0.1)	4.2 (5.0)	69.8 (82.9)	0.1 (0.1)	— ()	0.7 (0.8)
Madhya Pradesh	572.8	22.1 (12.5)	5.4 (3.1)	21.8 (12.6)	1.4 (0.5)	23.9 (13.9)	490.5 (85.4)	3.7 (2.1)	0.7 (0.4)	3.3 (1.9)
Bombay	174.3	8.0 (4.6)	28.2 (16.2)	41.4 (23.8)	1.4 (0.8)	27.3 (15.6)	40.2 (23.1)	17.4 (10.0)	4.2 (2.4)	6.1 (3.5)
Hyderabad	206.9	3.8 (1.8)	1.9 (0.9)	19.7 (9.5)	6.7 (3.2)	45.8 (22.2)	104.9 (50.7)	22.0 (10.6)	— ()	2.0 (1.0)
Mysore	209.4	— ()	— ()	11.2 (5.4)	2.3 (1.1)	163.9 (78.3)	15.9 (7.6)	8.2 (3.9)	2.0 (1.0)	5.9 (2.8)
Madras	398.9	9.1 (2.3)	8.9 (2.2)	9.6 (2.4)	1.4 (0.4)	202.4 (50.7)	89.9 (22.5)	61.8 (15.5)	10.0 (2.5)	5.8 (1.5)

¹ To tenants only

**TABLE 188—AVERAGE DEBT PER CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED
ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY—STATE-WISE DATA**

[Amount in rupees Figures in brackets denote percentages to total debt]

State	Total debt	Govern- ment	Co opera- tives and com- mer- cial banks ¹	Re- la- tives	Land lords	Agri- cu- l- tur- ist money lenders	Pro- fes- sional money lenders	Traders and com- mis- sion agents	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Assam	218 8	27 4 (12 5)	1 3 (0 6)	125 4 (57 4)	0 3 (0 1)	34 0 (15 5)	19 6 (9 0)	7 9 (3 6)	2 9 (1 4)
West Bengal	164 6	12 0 (7 3)	2 4 (1 5)	50 8 (30 9)	5 1 (3 1)	3 3 (2 0)	90 4 (54 9)	0 5 (0 3)	0 1 (0 1)
Bihar	280 3	12 2 (4 4)	2 0 (0 7)	11 7 (4 2)	22 9 (8 2)	16 1 (5 7)	215 1 (76 7)	0 1 (-)	0 3 (0 1)
Uttar Pradesh	316 3	2 5 (0 8)	11 1 (3 5)	38 1 (12 0)	5 5 (1 7)	61 1 (20 3)	182 4 (57 7)	7 8 (2 5)	4 8 (1 5)
Punjab	417 0	23 8 (5 7)	13 6 (3 3)	139 5 (33 4)	52 4 (12 6)	1 4 (0 3)	183 4 (44 0)	- (-)	2 9 (0 7)
PEPSU	1,148 8	2 9 (0 2)	4 8 (0 4)	73 0 (5 3)	184 5 (16 1)	691 4 (60 2)	177 8 (15 5)	10 0 (0 9)	4 4 (0 4)
Rajasthan	563 1	1 6 (0 3)	3 0 (0 5)	56 8 (10 1)	2 9 (0 5)	0 6 (0 1)	483 8 (85 9)	1 6 (0 3)	12 8 (2 3)
Madhya Bharat	296 2	18 5 (6 2)	12 6 (4 2)	11 0 (3 7)	7 6 (2 6)	2 1 (0 7)	233 9 (79 0)	0 5 (0 2)	10 0 (3 4)
Vindhya Pradesh	128 6	1 2 (0 9)	0 4 (0 3)	2 9 (2 2)	8 7 (6 8)	32 9 (25 6)	81 2 (63 2)	1 0 (0 8)	0 3 (0 2)
Orissa	111 6	6 5 (5 9)	3 5 (3 1)	10 1 (9 1)	1 6 (1 4)	7 0 (6 3)	81 4 (72 9)	1 5 (1 3)	- (-)
Madhya Pradesh	224 9	38 2 (17 0)	8 5 (3 8)	24 4 (10 8)	3 6 (1 6)	19 7 (8 8)	124 2 (53 2)	5 1 (2 3)	1 2 (0 5)
Bombay	344 5	34 3 (10 0)	47 4 (13 7)	69 1 (20 0)	16 3 (4 7)	27 1 (7 9)	103 7 (31 6)	37 9 (11 0)	3 7 (1 1)
Hyderabad	282 6	7 9 (2 8)	4 2 (1 5)	25 4 (9 0)	6 8 (2 4)	66 3 (23 5)	149 1 (52 7)	21 1 (7 5)	1 8 (0 6)
Mysore	451 7	0 2 (0 1)	3 6 (0 8)	25 1 (5 5)	6 9 (1 5)	372 7 (82 1)	22 5 (5 0)	12 5 (2 8)	10 2 (2 3)
Madras	788 2	15 2 (1 9)	28 2 (3 6)	20 0 (2 5)	6 3 (0 8)	392 8 (49 8)	225 2 (28 6)	91 8 (11 7)	8 9 (1 1)

¹ Separate data on debt owed to co operatives and commercial banks are not available

credit obtained by cultivators. Cultivators did not report any borrowings from commercial banks in Assam, West Bengal, Bihar, Rajasthan and Hyderabad. In Madras and Bombay, the proportion of borrowings from commercial banks to the total borrowings was 2.5 per cent and 2.4 per cent respectively. In all other States only less than 2 per cent of the total borrowings were from commercial banks.

18.3.4 In three States, viz., Assam, the Punjab and West Bengal, more than 25 per cent of the total borrowings were from relatives. In Assam the proportion was as high as 65.7 per cent while in the Punjab it was 47.2 per cent. It has already been seen that in all the selected districts in Assam, viz., Cachar, Kamrup and Lakhimpur, substantial proportion of the borrowings was from relatives. In the Punjab, of the three districts surveyed, in two districts, viz., Hoshiarpur and Jullundur, the proportion of borrowings from relatives to the total borrowings was very high, exceeding 50 per cent. The proportion of debt owed to relatives to the total debt owed was 57.3 per cent in Assam, 33.4 per cent in the Punjab and 30.9 per cent in West Bengal. Borrowings from landlords did not constitute more than 5 per cent of the total borrowings from all agencies in any of the States. Borrowings from traders formed 10 per cent or more of the total borrowings in Bombay, Hyderabad and Madras. In Madras, where about 16 per cent of the total borrowings were from traders, the percentage is pulled up largely by Malabar where about 57 per cent of the total borrowings were from traders.

18.3.5 In PEPSU, Mysore and Madras, more than 50 per cent of the total borrowings were from agriculturist moneylenders. Vindhya Pradesh, where agriculturist moneylenders supplied 45.7 per cent of the total credit, and Hyderabad and Uttar Pradesh, where the proportion of borrowings from the agency was 22.2 per cent and 21.7 per cent respectively, are the next in importance. Professional moneylenders completely dominated the rural credit structure in Rajasthan, Orissa, Madhya Bharat and Bihar. In all these States more than 75 per cent of the total borrowings were from professional moneylenders. In West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Hyderabad also, more than half the borrowings were from this agency. The agency did not play a prominent role in a few States such as Assam and the Punjab, where finance from relatives was important, in PEPSU, Mysore and Madras, where agriculturist moneylenders' finance was important, and in Bombay where co-operatives, traders, agriculturist moneylenders and relatives together supplied more than 65 per cent of the total credit.

18.3.6 In table 18.9 we give the regional averages of borrowings of cultivators from various credit agencies. The regional averages relating to debt owed by cultivators to various credit agencies are given in table 18.10. Borrowings from Government accounted for a fairly large proportion of the total borrowings of cultivators in the Assam-Bengal and Central India regions; the proportion of borrowings from Government to the total borrowings was 10.7 per cent in the former region and 14.0 per cent in the latter region. The proportion, however, does not give a correct picture of the role of Government as the volume of total borrowings in these two regions was relatively small. Thus, whereas in the Punjab-PEPSU region the average

TABLE 189—AVERAGE BORROWINGS PER CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY—REGIONAL DATA

[Amount in rupees Figures in brackets 1 note percentages to total borrowings]

Region	Total borrowings	Government	Co-operatives	Relatives	Landlords	Agriculturist money lenders	Professional money lenders	Factors and commission agents	Commercial banks	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1 Assam Bengal	119.2	1 ^o 7 (10.7)	0.5 (0.4)	68.3 (57.3)	5.3 (4.4)	17.8 (14.9)	11.3 (9.5)	1.5 (1.3)	()	1.8 (1.5)
2 Bihar Bengal	148.0	6.4 (4.3)	1 ^o (0.8)	99.3 (15.1)	4.2 (2.8)	1 ^o 6 (8.5)	99.7 (67.4)	1 ^o (0.8)	- ()	0.4 (0.3)
3 Eastern Uttar Pradesh	167.0	0.4 (0.2)	5.8 (3.5)	23.0 (13.8)	1.3 (0.8)	48.0 (28.7)	78.3 (46.9)	2.1 (1.3)	()	8.1 (4.8)
4 Western Uttar Pradesh	253.2	0.8 (0.3)	2.4 (1.0)	50.5 (19.9)	4.8 (1.9)	33.3 (13.7)	149.7 (59.1)	10.5 (4.1)	0.5 (0.2)	0.7 (0.3)
5 Punjab PEPSU	261.7	20.4 (7.8)	5.9 (2.2)	70.9 (30.5)	8.8 (3.4)	78.5 (30.0)	83.0 (21.1)	3.8 (1.4)	0.7 (0.3)	0.7 (0.3)
6 Rajasthan	277.6	1.8 (0.6)	- ()	20 ^o (10.5)	1.3 (0.5)	- ()	238.4 (35.8)	1.0 (0.4)	()	6.1 (2.2)
7 Central India	229.1	32.0 (14.0)	3.4 (1.5)	11.4 (5.0)	7.2 (3.1)	16.9 (7.4)	153.4 (66.9)	0.8 (0.3)	0.9 (0.4)	3.3 (1.4)
8 Orissa and East Madhya Pradesh	90.5	3.3 (3.7)	3.0 (3.3)	10.9 (12.1)	0.3 (0.3)	15.6 (17.2)	55.5 (61.3)	0.6 (0.7)	0.3 (0.3)	1.0 (1.1)
9 Western Cotton region	238.3	10.4 (4.4)	27.7 (11.6)	54.6 (22.9)	7.1 (3.0)	15.7 (6.6)	8 ^o 2 (31.5)	27.8 (11.6)	5.2 (2.2)	7.6 (3.2)
10 North Deccan	235.5	5.7 (2.4)	10.7 (7.1)	24.0 (10.2)	0.8 (0.3)	90.9 (38.6)	76.4 (32.5)	16.3 (6.9)	1.5 (0.6)	3.2 (1.4)
11 South Deccan	343.7	2.8 (0.8)	7.1 (2.1)	8.9 ()	2.4 (0.7)	20 ^o 0 (58.8)	96.1 (28.0)	5.0 (1.4)	15.6 (4.5)	3.8 (1.1)
12 East Coast	305.0	15.8 (5.2)	6 ^o (2.0)	10.5 (3.4)	1.4 (0.5)	183.8 (60.3)	61.6 (20.2)	20.8 (6.8)	3.5 (1.1)	1.4 (0.5)
13 West Coast	253.9	0.3 (0.1)	6.4 (2.5)	27.0 (10.7)	0.9 (0.4)	39.0 (15.4)	47.5 (18.7)	114.6 (45.1)	6.7 (2.6)	11.5 (4.5)

¹ To tenants only

TABLE 18.10—AVERAGE DEBT PER CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY—REGIONAL DATA

[Amount in rupees. Figures in brackets denote percentages to total debt]

Region	Total debt	Government	Co-operatives and commercial banks ¹	Relatives	Land lords	Agriculturist money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1 Assam Bengal	200.4	35.1 (17.5)	1.0 (0.5)	104.1 (52.0)	4.8 (2.4)	28.1 (14.1)	26.1 (13.0)	6.4 (3.2)	2.6 (1.3)
2 Bihar Bengal	229.9	13.5 (5.9)	2.6 (1.1)	28.9 (12.6)	12.4 (5.4)	18.0 (7.8)	152.1 (66.1)	2.0 (0.9)	0.5 (0.2)
3 Eastern Uttar Pradesh	297.9	0.9 (0.3)	6.7 (2.2)	27.5 (9.2)	3.1 (1.1)	75.4 (25.3)	173.0 (58.1)	3.1 (1.1)	8.0 (2.7)
4 Western Uttar Pradesh	353.3	1.6 (0.5)	17.3 (4.9)	56.2 (15.9)	9.3 (2.6)	42.0 (11.9)	214.8 (60.8)	11.5 (3.2)	0.7 (0.2)
5 Punjab-PEPSU	607.8	16.5 (2.7)	10.7 (1.8)	116.1 (19.1)	87.8 (14.5)	194.1 (31.9)	175.8 (28.9)	3.4 (0.6)	3.3 (0.5)
6 Rajasthan	562.8	1.6 (0.3)	3.0 (0.5)	56.8 (10.1)	2.8 (0.5)	0.5 (0.1)	483.7 (86.0)	1.5 (0.3)	12.7 (2.2)
7 Central India	290.5	51.1 (17.6)	6.7 (2.3)	15.0 (5.2)	12.3 (4.2)	13.8 (4.7)	180.8 (62.0)	0.7 (0.2)	4.9 (1.7)
8 Orissa and E. & M. Madhya Pradesh	132.4	7.0 (5.3)	5.6 (4.2)	13.7 (10.3)	1.4 (1.1)	16.3 (12.3)	86.4 (65.2)	2.0 (1.5)	0.1 (0.1)
9 Western Cotton region	355.8	40.4 (11.3)	39.2 (11.0)	71.5 (20.1)	26.2 (7.4)	7.1 (2.0)	127.1 (35.7)	38.0 (10.7)	6.4 (1.8)
10 North Deccan	392.6	16.2 (4.1)	28.5 (7.2)	38.0 (9.7)	2.2 (0.6)	132.0 (33.6)	142.4 (36.3)	31.8 (8.1)	1.0 (0.3)
11 South Deccan	758.6	8.6 (1.1)	29.9 (3.9)	23.2 (3.1)	4.4 (0.6)	416.6 (54.8)	263.1 (34.7)	6.9 (0.9)	5.9 (0.8)
12 East Coast	638.5	23.7 (3.7)	19.0 (3.0)	20.8 (3.2)	1.4 (0.2)	359.6 (56.3)	123.8 (19.4)	58.7 (9.2)	1.6 (0.3)
13 West Coast	391.0	2.2 (0.6)	18.4 (4.7)	40.7 (10.4)	14.0 (3.6)	62.3 (16.0)	110.1 (28.2)	126.8 (32.4)	16.5 (4.2)

¹ Separate data on debt owed to co-operatives and commercial banks are not available

borrowing from Government was Rs 20 4 per family in the Assam Bengal region it was only Rs 12 7 per family. The proportion of borrowings from Government to the total borrowings was however 7 8 per cent in the Punjab PEPSU region as against 10 7 per cent in Assam Bengal.

18 3 7 It was noted that for the country as a whole only 3 1 per cent of the total borrowings of cultivating families was from co operatives. The proportion of borrowings from co operatives to the total borrowings however varied from region to region it being the highest at 11 6 per cent in the Western Cotton region. Borrowings from commercial banks were largely confined to the regions of the South and West. The proportion of borrowings from commercial banks to the total borrowings was 2 2 per cent in the Western Cotton region 2 6 per cent in West Coast and 4 5 per cent in South Deccan.

18 3 8 Borrowings from relatives were proportionately large in two regions viz Assam Bengal and Punjab PEPSU where the proportion of borrowings from relatives to the total borrowings was 57 3 per cent and 30 5 per cent respectively. In Western Uttar Pradesh and the Western Cotton region also relatives played a significant role in the finance of cultivators. The proportion of borrowings from land lords to the total borrowings was the highest at 4 4 per cent in the Assam Bengal region and the lowest at 0 3 per cent in Orissa and East Madhya Pradesh and North Deccan. Traders played the most significant role in the finance of cultivators in West Coast. In this region as high as 45 1 per cent of the total borrowings were from traders. In Quilon and Malabar of this region as was seen before trade in spices and other garden crops is important. Significantly enough the other region in which finance from traders was important is the Western Cotton region in this region the average borrowing from traders per family was Rs 27 8 which formed 11 6 per cent of the total borrowings.

18 3 9 The proportion of borrowings from agriculturist moneylenders varied from region to region. Agriculturist moneylenders were more important than professional moneylenders in the Assam Bengal Punjab PEPSU North Deccan South Deccan and East Coast regions. In the South Deccan and East Coast regions the agriculturist moneylenders supplied the major part of the total credit. Professional moneylenders supplied more than half the total finance in the Bihar Bengal Western Uttar Pradesh Rajasthan Central India and Orissa and East Madhya Pradesh regions. In some of the other regions although professional moneylenders did not predominate their role in the supply of credit was important. Only in a few regions such as the Assam Bengal West Coast and the East Coast was their role comparatively of lesser importance.

18 4 BORROWINGS AND DEBT OF NON CULTIVATORS IN THE DIFFERENT DISTRICTS

18 4 1 The average amount borrowed by non cultivators was much smaller than that borrowed by cultivators. Whereas the average borrowings per cultivating family ranged from Rs 30 in Sirohi to Rs 578 in West Godavari that per

non-cultivating family varied from Rs 3 in Koraput to Rs 233 in Bhatinda. In 18 of the 75 districts the average amount borrowed by non-cultivators from all agencies was Rs 25 or less per family. Table 18.11 gives district wise data on the average borrowing of non-cultivators from each of the different credit agencies. The borrowing from each of the credit agencies expressed as percentage of the total borrowings is also given in the table.

18.4.2 In 46 of the 75 selected districts non-cultivators reported borrowings from Government. However only in six districts viz Tripura Parbhani Cachar Sorath Jalpaiguri and Hazaribagh did borrowings of non-cultivators from Government form more than 10 per cent of their total borrowings. In respect of these districts the number of families borrowing from Government as percentage of the total number of borrowing families and the average borrowing from Government per family borrowing from Government are given in the following table.

District	Borrowings from Government as percentage of total borrowings	Proportion of families borrowing from Government to the total number of borrowing families (Per cent)	Average amount borrowed from Government per family borrowing from Government (Rs)
1 Tripura	44.5	24.7	35
2 Parbhani	22.1	3.3	1870
3 Cachar	19.6	7.0	469
4 Sorath	13.7	5.3	830
5 Jalpaiguri	13.7	4.8	420
6 Hazaribagh	11.1	11.8	60

18.4.3 The fact that except in Hazaribagh the average borrowing per borrowing family exceeded Rs 300 would seem to indicate that most of the non-cultivating families reporting borrowings from Government in these districts were probably non-cultivating landlords traders etc. who were in a position to offer adequate security to Government. Out of the 46 districts in which borrowing from Government was reported in 25 districts the per reporting family borrowing from Government exceeded Rs 100. This points to the generally superior economic position of non-cultivators borrowing from Government. In three districts viz Hissar Namtal and Parbhani the average borrowing from Government per reporting family was Rs 1000 or more.

18.4.4 In 29 districts none of the non-cultivating families reported borrowing from co-operatives. In 26 districts the borrowings from co-operatives accounted for less than 1 per cent of the total borrowings while in 20 districts 1 per cent or more of the total borrowings were from co-operatives. In eight districts more than 5 per cent of the total borrowings were from co-operatives these districts are Broach Deoria Poona Kolhapur Hoshiarpur Ahmedabad Ratnagiri and Nagpur. The table on page 35 presents some relevant data for these districts.

TABLE 18 II—AVERAGE BORROWINGS PER NON CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY

[Amount in rupees Figures in brackets denote percentages to total borrowings]

State District	Total borrowings	Government	Co-operative	Relatives	Landlords	Agriculturist money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Commercial banks	Others
	1		3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Assam										
Lakhimpur	6	()	()	5 (88.2)	()	()	1 (11.8)	()	()	()
Cachar	56	11 (19.6)	()	7 (12.5)	()	18 (32.2)	()	()	()	()
Kamrup	133	4 (3.1)	()	95 (71.5)	()	17 (12.8)	1 (0.8)	16 (11.8)	()	(0.1)
Tripura										
Tripura	25	11 (44.5)	()	5 (18.7)	()	2 (6.6)	4 (17.3)	3 (12.6)	()	(0.2)
West Bengal										
Jalpaiguri	21	3 (13.7)	(0.7)	5 (22.2)	(0.7)	()	12 (57.8)	(2.3)	()	1 (2.6)
Malda	72	(0.2)	(0.1)	23 (31.3)	(0.3)	()	49 (40.2)	0 (27.4)	()	(0.5)
Burdwan	40	3 (8.0)	(0.2)	13 (32.1)	(0.3)	2 (5.4)	22 (53.7)	(0.3)	()	(0.1)
Medinipur	34	(0.4)	(0.7)	16 (47.1)	()	()	18 (51.8)	()	()	()
Bihar										
Bhagalpur	132	(0.3)	()	1 ^a (5.9)	()	2 ^a (16.7)	9 ^a (73.9)	()	()	(0.2)
Monghyr	59	1 (1.1)	()	4 (6.1)	17 (28.6)	()	38 (63.5)	()	()	(0.7)
Hazaribagh	14	1 (11.1)	()	1 (4.0)	(1.2)	3 (23.3)	8 (60.5)	()	()	()
Palamou	39	(0.1)	()	1 (2.0)	()	()	38 (97.9)	()	()	()
Uttar Pradesh										
Muzaffarpur	21	()	(0.3)	2 (9.5)	3 (14.2)	14 (67.8)	1 (2.0)	6 (6.2)	()	()
Ballia	82	()	(0.1)	8 (9.9)	5 (5.5)	41 (50.1)	30 (24.0)	8 (10.2)	()	(0.2)
Doon	83	(0.7)	12 (13.9)	6 (7.1)	(0.2)	9 (10.4)	46 (55.4)	1 (3.0)	(0.7)	9 (11.6)
Jaunpur	90	()	()	9 (9.7)	1 (0.6)	28 (31.0)	49 (54.6)	3 (3.6)	()	(0.5)
Sultanpur	37	()	(0.6)	1 ^a (31.3)	()	()	17 (45.8)	3 (7.1)	()	6 (15.2)
Satapur	9	()	(0.7)	6 (74.3)	()	()	2 (22.1)	1 (9.9)	()	()
Kanpur	56	(0.2)	(0.9)	1 ^a (0.6)	13 (22.4)	8 (13.9)	22 (40.0)	1 (1.4)	()	(0.6)

^a To tenants only

**TABLE 18 II—AVERAGE BORROWINGS PER NON CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY—
Continued**

[Amount in rupees Figures in brackets denote percentages to total borrowings]

State/District	Total borrowings	Government	Co-operative	Relatives	Landlord ¹	Agriculturist money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Commercial banks	Others
	1		3	4	5	6		8	9	1
Uttar Pradesh										
—Concld										
Hamirpur	56	()	(0.6)	(0.4)	(17.3)	(0.6)	(36.1)	()	()	(0.7)
Shahjahanpur	77	(0.1)	(2.6)	(5.4)	()	(8.6)	(48.0)	(33.0)	()	(0.3)
Agra	119	(1.3)	(0.0)	(4.9)	(0.0)	()	(91.3)	(0.8)	()	(1.3)
Aligarh	88	(0.1)	(0.3)	(13.0)	()	()	(50.5)	(1.2)	()	(1.4)
Naunital	96	(0.6)	(0.3)	(14.8)	(0.3)	()	(1.6)	(8.5)	()	(1.6)
Meerut	143	()	(0.0)	(0.4.6)	(1.4)	(53.5)	(5.4)	(13.6)	()	(1.3)
Himachal Pradesh										
Burmoor	38	()	()	(19.0)	(19.0)	(10.5)	(15.0)	(0.0)	()	(0.6)
Punjab										
Hoshiarpur	102	(0.5)	(6.9)	(56.5)	(0.5.0)	()	(10.0)	()	()	()
Jullundur	103	(1.4)	(5.0)	(54.1)	(5.9)	()	(33.8)	()	()	()
Hissar	46	(0.5)	()	(19.0)	(15.1)	(0.6)	(40.5)	(14.0)	()	()
PEPSU										
Bhatinda	233	(0.1)	()	(9.5)	(14.3)	(61.5)	(10.6)	(0.6)	(1.0)	(0.1)
Mohandergarh	167	()	()	(0.1)	()	(00.4)	(9.5)	()	()	()
Rajasthan										
Churu	8	()	()	()	()	()	(5.0)	()	()	(0.5.0)
Barmer	22	()	()	(75.6)	()	()	(0.4.4)	()	()	()
Sirohi	21	()	()	(0.0)	()	()	(95.0)	()	(3)	()
Jaipur	28	()	()	()	()	()	(100.0)	()	()	()
Sawai Madhopur	174	()	()	(1.1)	()	()	(95.9)	()	()	()
Chittorgarh	70	(0.1)	()	(1.4)	()	()	(98.3)	(0.1)	()	()

¹ To tenants only

TABLE 18 II—AVERAGE BORROWINGS PER NON CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY—Continued

[Amount in rupees. Figures in brackets denote percentages to total borrowings]

State District	Total borrowings	Government	Co-operative	Realty	Land loans	Agricultural money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commercial agents	Commercial banks	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Madhya Bharat										
Jhabua	5	()	()	()	()	(4.3)	(87.0)	()	()	(8.7)
Shivpur	31	()	()	()	(1.4)	()	(98.6)	()	()	()
Shajapur	115	()	()	5	9	11	89	1	()	()
Bhilsa	103	()	()	(4.1)	(8.2)	(9.7)	(77.6)	(0.5)	()	()
		()	()	1	6	()	89	()	()	7
				(1.1)	(5.4)		(86.4)	(0.1)		(7.0)
Bhopal										
Raisen	58	()	()	(0.5)	46	()	1*	(20.3)	()	(0.1)
					(79.1)					
Vindhya Pradesh										
Satna	20	()	(0.1)	1	()	18	1	(1.2)	()	(1.2)
				(2.5)		(88.8)	(6.2)			
Rewa	19	()	()	3	()	14	14	(0.5)	()	(0.5)
				(2.0)	(13.3)	(19.7)	(71.1)			
Orissa										
Sambalpur	22	(0.3)	()	1	()	4	17	()	()	()
				(2.8)		(18.5)	(78.1)			
Puri	48	(0.8)	(3.5)	3	(0.1)	()	40	(2.7)	(1.0)	(2.5)
				(5.5)			(83.8)			
Koraput	3	(0.5)	(0.5)	3	()	()	3	()	()	()
				(1.7)			(97.3)			
Madhya Pradesh										
Bhopur	19	()	(0.4)	8	()	4	7	()	()	()
				(43.8)		(1.3)	(31.5)			
Durg	9	()	()	1	()	9	5	()	()	(1.9)
				(13.5)		(27.7)	(56.8)			
Chanda	28	1	()	5	1	20	6	(4.4)	(0.7)	(3.6)
		(0.0)	(0.1)	(18.2)	(5.0)	()	(66.6)			
Nagpur	40	1	(5.1)	9	3	12	9	(21.7)	()	(11.8)
		(1.5)		(2.3)	(8.6)	()	(29.0)			
Sagar	54	4	()	4	()	45	45	(0.1)	()	(1.6)
		(6.8)		(7.6)		(0.9)	(83.0)			
Akola	20	(2.1)	(3.4)	1	2	7	3	()	(0.1)	(3.8)
				(21.4)	(10.3)	(36.4)	(14.5)			
Saurashtra										
Sorath	142	19	()	11	(0.1)	(0.2)	85	26	()	(0.2)
		(13.7)		(7.9)			(59.5)	(18.5)		
Bombay										
Ahmedabad	74	(0.0)	(6.0)	34	(0.2)	1	14	18	()	(3.9)
				(45.5)		(1.2)	(18.3)	(21.5)		
Broach	38	1	6	9	8	5	2	()	()	(7.2)
		(1.5)	(16.7)	(23.8)	(20.6)	()	(13.9)	(5.4)		

* To tenants only

TABLE 18.11—AVERAGE BORROWINGS PER NON-CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY
—Concluded

[Amount in rupees Figures in brackets denote percentages to total borrowings]

State/District	Total borrowings	Government	Co-operatives	Relatives	Land lords ¹	Agriculturist money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Commercial banks	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Bombay—Concld										
West Khandesh	21	— (—)	— (1.4)	8 (35.6)	— (—)	9 (42.9)	2 (9.8)	2 (10.3)	— (—)	— (—)
Poona	38	— (0.7)	4 (11.4)	5 (13.2)	2 (5.6)	— (0.6)	17 (45.5)	1 (3.0)	— (0.5)	8 (19.5)
Ratnagiri	39	— (—)	2 (5.2)	22 (57.4)	— (—)	— (—)	7 (17.7)	8 (19.6)	— (—)	— (—)
Kolhapur	31	— (—)	2 (8.0)	3 (9.6)	— (—)	— (—)	22 (70.6)	4 (11.8)	— (—)	— (—)
Bijapur	83	— (—)	2 (2.8)	24 (28.3)	— (—)	50 (60.2)	6 (7.1)	1 (1.1)	— (—)	— (0.5)
Hyderabad										
Osmanabad	61	— (0.1)	— (—)	20 (32.9)	— (0.4)	32 (53.1)	5 (8.8)	3 (4.4)	— (—)	— (0.3)
Farbhami	55	12 (22.4)	1 (0.9)	9 (16.2)	1 (1.0)	7 (12.1)	20 (35.5)	3 (5.9)	— (—)	3 (5.9)
Nizamabad	46	— (—)	2 (3.3)	3 (7.4)	1 (1.3)	13 (28.2)	27 (58.3)	1 (1.2)	— (—)	— (0.3)
Mahbubnagar	85	— (—)	1 (1.6)	3 (2.9)	— (0.2)	6 (7.3)	73 (86.6)	1 (1.4)	— (—)	— (—)
Mysore										
Hassan	54	— (—)	— (0.2)	— (—)	— (—)	39 (71.0)	— (—)	14 (25.6)	2 (3.2)	— (0.1)
Bangalore	90	— (—)	— (—)	17 (18.7)	4 (4.1)	44 (48.8)	18 (20.1)	6 (6.8)	— (0.3)	1 (1.2)
Madras										
Coimbatore	59	— (—)	1 (2.3)	6 (9.6)	1 (1.9)	17 (28.9)	29 (48.1)	1 (1.1)	4 (7.3)	— (0.8)
Cuddapah	132	— (0.1)	1 (1.0)	1 (0.7)	1 (0.6)	69 (52.5)	49 (36.9)	— (—)	— (—)	11 (8.2)
Kurnool	98	— (—)	1 (0.9)	5 (5.1)	1 (0.5)	69 (70.4)	13 (13.5)	9 (9.6)	— (—)	— (—)
West Godavari	159	— (0.3)	3 (2.2)	17 (10.4)	— (—)	85 (53.2)	8 (5.3)	23 (14.5)	21 (13.2)	1 (0.9)
Chingleput	86	— (1.2)	— (0.3)	13 (14.9)	13 (15.2)	26 (30.3)	25 (29.6)	3 (3.1)	4 (5.0)	— (0.4)
Ramanathapuram	31	— (0.7)	— (0.6)	1 (1.7)	— (—)	15 (49.2)	7 (24.0)	7 (22.5)	— (1.1)	— (0.2)
Malabar	52	— (—)	— (0.3)	— (—)	2 (3.6)	10 (20.1)	5 (9.0)	31 (60.3)	— (0.6)	3 (6.1)
Travancore—Cochin										
Quilon	85	— (—)	1 (1.6)	12 (14.3)	2 (2.1)	— (—)	24 (28.1)	42 (49.3)	2 (2.7)	2 (1.9)

¹ To tenants only

District		Proportion of	
		borrowing families	co-operatives
		(Per cent)	(Rs)
1 Broach	16.7	10.1	315
2 Deorah	13.9	2.3	119
3 Poona	11.4	15.0	3.7
4 Kolhapur	8.9	15.8	117
5 Hoshangpur	6.9	1.7	115
6 Ahmedabad	6.2	4	484
7 Ratnagiri	5.2	8.3	245
8 Nagpur	5.1	1.7	367

The high average borrowing per borrowing family would indicate that the non-cultivating families who borrowed from co-operatives were probably substantial traders landlords etc

18.4.5 Borrowings from commercial banks were reported in 16 districts. In the following table some relevant data in regard to these borrowings are set out

District	Total borrowings	per family	Percentage number of borrowing families	Borrowings from commercial banks
		(Rs)	(Per cent)	(Rs)
1 West Godavari	13.4	21.0	0.1	351.10
2 Coimbatore	7.3	4.3	5.4	283
3 Chingleput	5.0	4.3	0.7	28.0
4 Hassan	3.2	1.7	0.5	2000
5 Quilon	2.7	0.0	6.3	5
6 Sirohi	2.3	0.5	1.0	1500
7 Ramanathapuram	1.1	0.3	0	600
8 Puri	1.0	0.5	1.1	80
9 Bhatinda	1.0	0.4	0.3	1700
10 Deorah	0.7	0.6	0.3	400
11 Malabar	0.6	0.3	0.7	71
12 Poona	0.5	0.2	0.7	350
13 Bangalore	0.3	0.0	0.6	15
14 Chanda	0.0	0.0	2.3	7
15 Akola	0.1	0.0	0.3	50
16 Cuddapah			0.0	33

In a number of districts in which the average borrowing per borrowing family was relatively high the percentage of families borrowing from commercial banks among total number of borrowing families was negligible. In West Godavari the amount borrowed per borrowing family was high but the proportion of families borrowing from banks was only 0.1 per cent of the total number of borrowing families. In Coimbatore and Chingleput we have a significant percentage of borrowers together

with a moderate level of amount borrowed per borrower, while in Quilon a significant percentage coexisted with a low average amount borrowed indicative of the banking system reaching a much lower stratum in this district than elsewhere

18 4 6 In all except six of the districts borrowings from relatives were reported. In 17 districts the proportion of borrowings from relatives to the total borrowings was between 20 and 50 per cent, while in 7 districts more than 50 per cent of the total borrowings were from relatives. As may be seen from the table below, in all except one of the districts in which finance by relatives was specially important more than 50 per cent of the borrowing families borrowed from relatives

District	Borrowings from relatives as percentage of total borrowings	Average amount borrowed per family from all agencies	Proportion of families borrowing from relatives to the total number of borrowing families
		(Rs)	(Per cent)
1 Lakhimpur	88 2	6	98 5
2 Barmer	75 6	22	69 2
3 Sitapur	74 3	9	56 3
4 Kamrup	71 5	133	57 7
5 Ratnagiri	57 4	39	35 0
6 Hoshiarpur	56 8	102	67 1
7 Jullundur	54 1	103	67 3

18 4 7 In 44 out of the 75 selected districts, varying amounts were reported to have been borrowed from landlords. Borrowings from landlords exceeded Rs 12 per family only in Raizen, Hamirpur, Monghyr, Hoshiarpur, Kanpur, Bhatinda and Chingleput. Among these, except in Bhatinda and Chingleput, the proportion of borrowings from landlords to the total borrowings from all agencies exceeded 20 per cent, in Raizen the proportion was as high as 79 1 per cent. As already stated, due to variations in tenancy arrangements in different areas and in the interpretation of words like zamindar, landlord, etc., by the investigating staff, it is not unlikely that the definition of landlords so as to include only lendings of landlords to own tenants was not consistently adhered to. The difficulty of correctly differentiating between a tenant and a landless labourer and consequent inclusion of some of the tenants in the non-cultivator group also need to be mentioned at this stage. Some of the tenants at will whose status is not very much better than that of a labourer are also perhaps included in the non-cultivator group, borrowings from their landlords reported by such persons have obviously been classed as from 'landlords' by the Investigators.

18 4 8 Borrowings from traders were reported in 52 out of the 75 districts. However, except in 18 districts the borrowings from the agency formed less than 10 per cent of the total borrowings. Of these 18 districts only in 8 districts more than 20 per cent of the total borrowings were from traders. In Malabar and Quilon the proportion of borrowings from traders to the total borrowings was 60 3 per cent and

49·3 per cent respectively. It may be recalled that the trader was an important credit agency in the case of cultivators also in these districts. The table below gives the average borrowing per family and per borrowing family, from traders in the 18 districts where more than 10 per cent of the borrowings were from traders. It will be noted that the average borrowing per borrowing family was fairly large in most cases.

District	Borrowings from traders and commission agents as percentage of total borrowings	Average amount borrowed from traders and commission agents per family (Rs)	Proportion of families borrowing from traders and commission agents to the total number of borrowing families (Per cent)	Average amount borrowed from traders and commission agents per family borrowing from traders and commission agents (Rs)
1 Malabar	60·3	31	55·2	100
2 Quilon	49·3	42	61·2	114
3 Shahjahanpur	33·2	25	2·7	2·047
4 Mulda	27·4	20	3·6	1,327
5 Hassan	25·6	14	14·3	614
6 Ahmedabad	24·5	18	43·4	185
7 Ramanathapuram	22·5	7	15·3	139
8 Nagpur	21·7	9	4·4	598
9 Ratnagiri	19·6	8	7·1	1,076
10 Gorakhpur	18·6	20	26·1	227
11 West Godavari	14·5	23	20·8	184
12 Hissar	14·2	7	14·9	340
13 Meerut	13·6	19	19·6	210
14 Tripura	12·6	3	18·5	133
15 Kamrup	11·8	16	3·4	1,098
16 Kolhapur	11·8	4	3·2	867
17 West Khalasah	10·3	2	12·0	176
18 Ballia	10·2	8	6·6	251

18·4·9 In 42 out of the 75 districts either no borrowings or less than 10 per cent of the total borrowings were reported from agriculturist moneylenders. In 12 districts more than 50 per cent of the total borrowings were from agriculturist moneylenders. In these districts the average size of borrowings from agriculturist moneylenders per borrowing family varied from Rs 50 in Mirzapur to Rs 373 in Bhatinda. As may be seen from the table on next page in ten of these districts less than 15 per cent of the borrowings were from professional moneylenders. In the remaining districts viz Ballia and Cuddapah professional moneylenders were important, they supplied 21·0 per cent of the total borrowings in the former district and 36·9 per cent of the total borrowings in the latter.

18·4·10 In 13 districts either no borrowings or 10 per cent or less of the total borrowings were reported to be from professional moneylenders. In 29 districts the proportion of borrowings from professional moneylenders to the total borrowings varied between 10 and 50 per cent. Professional moneylenders supplied the major part of the credit in the remaining 33 districts. Of the 13 districts in which 10 per cent or less of the total borrowings were from professional moneylenders, in 8 districts, as was seen before, agriculturist moneylenders supplied more than half the

District	Borrowings from agricultural money lenders as percentage of total borrowings	Average amount borrowed from agricultural money lenders per family (Rs)	Proportion of families borrowing from agricultural money lenders to the total number of borrowing families (Per cent)	Average amount borrowed from agricultural money lenders per family borrowing from agriculturist moneylenders (Rs)	Borrowings from professional money-lenders as percentage of total borrowings
1 Mohindergarh	90.4	151	88.7	349	9.5
2 Satna	88.8	18	86.2	76	6.2
3 Hassan	71.0	39	87.3	234	-
4 Kurnool	70.4	69	77.2	162	13.5
5 Mirzapur	67.8	14	76.9	50	2.0
6 Bhatinda	61.8	144	69.5	373	10.6
7 Bijapur	60.2	50	64.9	213	7.1
8 Meerut	53.5	76	59.2	272	5.4
9 West Godavari	53.2	85	47.7	295	5.3
10 Osmanabad	53.1	32	59.8	178	8.8
11 Cuddapah	52.5	69	66.8	174	36.9
12 Ballia	50.1	41	55.8	147	24.0

total amount borrowed by non-cultivators The table below indicates the relative importance of the major private credit agencies in the remaining five districts

District	BORROWINGS FROM THE AGENCY AS PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL BORROWINGS			
	Professional moneylenders	Traders and commission agents	Relatives	Agriculturist moneylenders
1 Cachar	-	-	48.2	32.2
2 West Bhandesh	9.8	10.3	35.6	42.9
3 Kamrup	0.8	11.8	71.5	12.8
4 Hoshiarpur	10.0	-	56.8	-
5 Malabar	9.0	60.3	-	20.1

18.4.11 In table 18.12 we give the district data on the average debt and the proportion of debt owed by non-cultivating families to the various credit agencies. It will be seen from the table that the debt owed to Government formed 47.1 per cent of the total debt in Burdwan and 27.7 per cent, 23.0 per cent and 20.6 per cent of the total debt respectively in Cachar, Tripura and Nagpur. In four districts, 10 to 20 per cent of the debt of non-cultivators was owed to Government. Debt owed to co-operatives and commercial banks by non-cultivating families was 5 per cent or more of the total debt in only 10 out of the 75 selected districts. As separate data on debt owed to co-operatives are not available, a correct assessment of the role of co-operatives in this regard is not possible. In Tripura though the non-cultivators did not report any borrowings either from commercial banks or co-operatives, the volume of debt owed to these two agencies together was Rs 19 per family. Obviously, the debt reported would have been incurred prior to the period covered by the General Schedule.

TABLE 18.12—AVERAGE DEBT PER NON-CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY

[Amount in rupees. Figures in brackets denote percentages to total debt]

State/District	Total debt	Government	Co-operatives and commercial banks ¹	Rolatives	Land lords	Agriculturist money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Assam									
Lakhimpur	10	—	—	6	—	—	4	—	—
		(—)	(—)	(63 0)	(—)	(—)	(36 4)	(—)	(—)
Cachar	99	27	—	49	—	22	—	—	—
		(27 7)	(—)	(50 1)	(0 1)	(22 0)	(0 1)	(—)	(—)
Kamrup	266	10	—	114	—	78	48	16	—
		(3 7)	(—)	(43 0)	(—)	(29 2)	(18 2)	(5 9)	()
Tripura									
Tripura	48	11	19	7	—	3	5	3	—
		(23 0)	(39 7)	(14 1)	(—)	(6 4)	(10 2)	(6 5)	(0 1)
West Bengal									
Jalpaiguri	31	5	—	7	—	—	19	—	1
		(16 8)	(0 4)	(20 9)	(1 5)	(—)	(59 7)	(0 9)	(1 8)
Malda	78	—	1	22	—	—	38	18	—
		(—)	(0 7)	(27 9)	(—)	(0 5)	(48 2)	(22 7)	(—)
Burdwan	135	63	—	25	3	3	41	—	—
		(47 1)	(0 2)	(18 5)	(1 9)	(1 9)	(30 3)	(0 1)	(—)
Midnapore	38	—	—	18	—	—	19	—	—
		(0 5)	(0 5)	(48 4)	(—)	(—)	(50 8)	(—)	(—)
Bihar									
Bhagalpur	193	—	—	7	—	31	155	—	—
		(0 2)	(0 1)	(3 5)	(—)	(15 8)	(80 3)	(—)	(0 1)
Monghyr	115	1	—	5	37	—	70	—	1
		(0 9)	(—)	(4 7)	(32 3)	(0 1)	(61 3)	(—)	(0 7)
Hazratnagar	29	1	—	3	—	3	21	—	—
		(5 2)	(—)	(8 9)	(0 2)	(11 6)	(74 1)	(—)	(—)
Palamau	63	—	—	—	—	—	62	—	—
		(0 1)	(0 1)	(0 7)	(0 1)	(—)	(99 0)	(—)	(—)
Uttar Pradesh									
Mirzapur	49	—	—	1	7	38	1	—	1
		(—)	(0 6)	(2 7)	(14 8)	(77 6)	(1 7)	(0 6)	(2 0)
Balia	178	—	—	10	6	114	38	10	—
		(—)	(0 1)	(5 4)	(3 2)	(64 1)	(21 3)	(5 8)	(0 1)
Deoria	121	5	8	3	—	13	77	—	15
		(4 1)	(6 6)	(2 7)	(0 1)	(10 3)	(63 6)	(—)	(12 6)
Jaunpur	152	1	—	12	—	57	77	1	3
		(0 7)	(—)	(7 8)	(0 3)	(37 8)	(50 7)	(0 5)	(2 2)
Sultanpur	58	—	—	16	—	—	34	4	4
		(0 4)	(0 6)	(27 3)	(—)	(—)	(58 0)	(7 0)	(6 7)
Sitapur	19	—	—	13	—	—	6	—	—
		(—)	(1 3)	(68 8)	(—)	(—)	(28 6)	(1 3)	(—)
Kanpur	82	—	—	13	15	9	44	—	—
		(0 4)	(0 5)	(15 9)	(17 8)	(10 4)	(53 9)	(0 5)	(0 6)

¹ Separate data on debt owed to co-operatives and commercial banks are not available

TABLE 18 12—AVERAGE DEBT PER NON-CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY—Continued

[Amount in rupees. Figures in brackets denote percentages to total debt]

State District	Total debt	Government	Co-operatives and commercial banks ¹	Relatives	Land lords	Agriculturist money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Uttar Pradesh—Concluded									
Hamirpur	121	-	1	3	30	-	86	-	-
	()	()	(0.6)	(0.3)	(9.9)	(0.4)	(71.4)	(0.1)	(0.3)
Shahjahanpur	89	-	5	5	1	11	55	8	1
	(0.2)	(5.0)	(5.0)	(5.0)	(1.5)	(12.0)	(65.5)	(9.5)	(1.1)
Agra	194	-	3	5	-	-	153	1	2
	()	(1.6)	(0.5)	()	()	()	(94.2)	(0.3)	(1.1)
Aligarh	137	-	-	-	-	-	115	-	-
	()	(0.2)	(1.4)	()	()	()	(83.5)	(0.3)	(0.9)
Namital	243	3	6	37	1	-	187	8	-
	(1.0)	(2.5)	(15.3)	(0.5)	()	()	(77.2)	(3.5)	()
Meerut	199	-	-	39	9	116	13	21	1
	()	(0.1)	(19.6)	(4.4)	(58.3)	(6.5)	(10.4)	(0.7)	()
Himachal Pradesh									
Sirmoor	133	-	2	59	15	6	52	-	-
	()	(1.2)	(43.9)	(11.2)	(4.4)	(39.0)	(0.1)	(0.2)	()
Punjab									
Hoshiarpur	215	1	12	80	53	-	61	9	-
	(0.4)	(5.7)	(37.3)	(24.7)	()	()	(28.2)	(3.6)	(0.1)
Jullundur	219	6	11	81	30	-	82	-	-
	(3.0)	(5.0)	(36.9)	(17.6)	(0.1)	()	(37.2)	(0.2)	()
Hissar	148	6	2	35	27	2	73	4	-
	(4.0)	(1.3)	(23.6)	(18.2)	(1.0)	(49.3)	(2.5)	(0.1)	()
PEPSU									
Bhatinda	822	7	2	38	189	433	146	7	-
	(0.5)	(0.3)	(4.6)	(23.0)	(52.7)	(17.5)	(0.9)	()	()
Mohindergarh	474	-	-	-	-	417	56	-	-
	()	()	(0.1)	(0.1)	(85.1)	(11.7)	()	()	()
Rajasthan									
Churu	12	-	-	-	3	-	2	-	5
	()	()	()	()	(11.4)	()	(15.6)	()	(43.0)
Barmer	215	-	-	16	-	-	198	-	-
	()	()	(7.7)	()	()	()	(92.3)	()	()
Sirohi	393	-	15	9	2	-	366	-	2
	()	(3.7)	(2.3)	(0.5)	()	()	(93.0)	()	(0.5)
Jaipur	200	-	1	4	-	-	195	-	-
	()	(0.7)	(0.0)	(0.1)	()	()	(97.2)	()	()
Sawai Madhopur	346	-	1	9	12	-	316	-	6
	(0.4)	(0.3)	(2.5)	(3.6)	()	()	(91.5)	()	(1.7)
Chittorgarh	349	-	-	12	3	334	-	-	-
	()	()	(3.6)	()	(0.5)	(95.6)	()	()	()

¹ Separate data on debt owed to co-operatives and commercial banks are not available.

TABLE 18 12—AVERAGE DEBT PER NON-CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY—Continued

[Amount in rupees Figures in brackets denote percentages to total debt]

State/District	Total debt	Government	Co-operatives and commercial banks ¹	Relatives	Land lords	Agriculturist money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Madhya Bharat									
Jhabua	10	— (0.5)	— (—)	— ()	— (—)	— (2.4)	6 (66.3)	— ()	3 (30.8)
Shivpuri	96	— (—)	— (—)	4 (4.1)	3 (3.4)	— ()	88 (92.5)	— (—)	— (—)
Shajapur	144	— (—)	2 (1.1)	5 (3.6)	10 (7.7)	13 (9.2)	114 (79.2)	— (0.2)	— (—)
Bilasa	125	— (0.3)	2 (1.5)	4 (3.0)	9 (7.0)	— (—)	101 (80.5)	1 (1.0)	8 (6.7)
Bhopal									
Raisen	98	7 (7.5)	— (—)	2 (2.0)	53 (54.0)	— (—)	36 (36.4)	— (—)	— (0.1)
Vindhya Pradesh									
Satna	20	— (—)	— (1.6)	1 (4.8)	3 (16.8)	10 (50.0)	5 (24.4)	— (—)	— (2.4)
Rewa	35	— (—)	1 (0.2)	1 (2.5)	6 (18.0)	3 (8.8)	24 (69.4)	— (0.3)	— (0.8)
Orissa									
Sambalpur	28	— (0.7)	— (0.2)	1 (3.5)	— (0.5)	9 (30.5)	18 (64.6)	— (—)	— (—)
Puti	80	1 (0.8)	3 (3.3)	4 (5.2)	1 (0.7)	— (0.4)	71 (88.0)	1 (1.6)	— (—)
Koraput	4	— (0.4)	— (0.4)	— (2.7)	— (0.4)	— (—)	4 (95.8)	— (0.2)	— (0.1)
Madhya Pradesh									
Bilaspur	28	— (0.1)	— (0.3)	8 (27.8)	— (0.3)	3 (11.2)	17 (60.3)	— (—)	— (—)
Durg	13	— (—)	— (0.4)	1 (7.7)	— (—)	1 (10.3)	11 (81.6)	— (—)	— (—)
Chanda	51	1 (1.9)	4 (8.8)	8 (15.7)	2 (3.4)	— (0.7)	33 (65.0)	2 (4.3)	— (0.2)
Nagpur	65	13 (20.6)	3 (4.0)	14 (21.4)	4 (6.4)	— (—)	16 (25.1)	11 (16.8)	4 (5.7)
Sagar	80	12 (15.3)	— (—)	5 (6.3)	— (—)	— (0.3)	61 (76.8)	— (—)	1 (1.3)
Akola	29	1 (2.1)	1 (2.1)	6 (21.3)	3 (12.2)	3 (10.2)	13 (46.4)	1 (4.3)	— (1.4)
Saurashtra									
Sorath	150	20 (12.9)	— (—)	13 (8.6)	— (—)	— (—)	90 (60.1)	27 (18.2)	— (0.2)
Bombay									
Ahmedabad	235	6 (2.5)	7 (3.0)	70 (29.8)	12 (5.3)	2 (1.0)	90 (38.4)	41 (17.4)	6 (2.6)
Broach	73	4 (5.2)	7 (9.1)	15 (20.8)	10 (13.5)	— (0.4)	20 (27.3)	9 (12.0)	9 (11.8)

¹ Separate data on debt owed to co-operatives and commercial banks are not available.

TABLE 18.12—AVERAGE DEBT PER NON-CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY—Concluded

[Amount in rupees Figures in brackets denote percentages to total debt]

State District	Total debt	Government	Co-operatives and commercial banks ¹	Relatives	Land lords	Agriculturist money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Bombay—Concd									
West Khandesh	39	— (0 3)	1 (3 1)	11 (27 5)	— ()	4 (11 5)	16 (42 0)	6 (15 6)	— (—)
Poona	130	4 (2 9)	13 (9 6)	26 (19 8)	2 (1 6)	— (—)	78 (59 7)	8 (6 4)	— ()
Ratnagiri	183	— ()	2 (1 2)	63 (34 2)	— (0 2)	— ()	53 (28 8)	65 (35 3)	1 (0 3)
Kolhapur	78	— (—)	2 (3 0)	8 (10 1)	— (0 8)	— ()	63 (80 7)	4 (5 4)	— (—)
Bijapur	119	3 (2 0)	4 (3 2)	24 (20 3)	— (0 1)	66 (55 9)	15 (12 4)	7 (6 0)	— (0 1)
Hyderabad									
Omanabad	115	— (0 2)	— (0 1)	28 (24 3)	— (0 3)	65 (56 1)	19 (16 7)	3 (2 2)	— (0 1)
Parbhani	78	13 (16 2)	2 (2 7)	9 (11 6)	1 (0 9)	4 (5 2)	40 (51 2)	8 (10 8)	1 (1 4)
Nizamabad	126	— (—)	4 (3 1)	8 (6 1)	6 (5 0)	21 (16 7)	87 (68 5)	1 (0 5)	— (0 1)
Mahbubnagar	150	— (0 3)	1 (0 7)	3 (1 8)	— (—)	7 (4 5)	13 (92 1)	1 (0 6)	— (—)
Mysore									
Hassan	171	16 (9 2)	10 (5 8)	— ()	— (0 1)	127 (73 5)	— (0 1)	19 (11 0)	— (—)
Bangalore	190	— ()	1 (0 4)	23 (12 3)	— (3 1)	127 (67 0)	28 (14 6)	1 (0 5)	4 (1 5)
Madras									
Coimbatore	142	— (0 1)	7 (4 6)	13 (9 2)	1 (0 6)	42 (29 7)	77 (54 5)	2 (1 2)	— (0 1)
Cuddapah	252	— (0 1)	7 (2 8)	6 (2 2)	— (—)	151 (60 1)	76 (30 2)	12 (4 6)	— (—)
Kurnool	201	3 (1 3)	3 (1 4)	6 (3 0)	1 (0 3)	149 (74 3)	2 (1 1)	17 (8 6)	— (—)
West Godavari	221	1 (0 3)	17 (7 9)	25 (11 4)	— ()	121 (54 8)	17 (7 5)	39 (17 4)	2 (0 7)
Chingleput	188	1 (0 5)	5 (2 6)	21 (11 3)	6 (3 0)	23 (12 1)	150 (69 2)	2 (1 1)	— (0 2)
Ramanathapuram	209	— (0 1)	1 (0 3)	7 (3 1)	— ()	100 (48 6)	80 (38 2)	20 (9 7)	— (—)
Malabar	63	— ()	— (0 4)	— (—)	— (0 3)	13 (19 7)	5 (7 9)	41 (64 7)	5 (7 0)
Travancore-Cochin									
Quilon	91	— ()	3 (3 5)	11 (12 1)	1 (1 6)	— (0 1)	41 (45 1)	30 (32 3)	5 (5 3)

¹ Separate data on debt owed to co-operatives and commercial banks are not available

18 4 12 In six districts viz Sitapur Lakhimpur Cachar Kamrup Midnapore and Sirmoor more than 40 per cent of the total debt of non cultivators was owed to relatives In Kamrup Sirmoor and Cachar the average debt owed to relatives was relatively high at Rs 114 Rs 59 and Rs 49 respectively per family In the three other districts the debt owed to the agency was relatively small averaging less than Rs 20 per family In 6 out of the 75 districts viz Raizen Churu Monghyr Hoshiarpur, Hamirpur and Bhatinda more than 20 per cent of the total debt was owed to land lords In Churu where the average debt owed to landlords was only Rs 5 per family the proportion was high because of the low volume of total debt

18 4 13 In 7 out of the 75 selected districts more than 60 per cent of the debt of non cultivators was owed to agriculturist moneylenders Of these 7 districts two each are in Madras and Mysore where the agriculturist moneylender was an important credit agency for cultivators also The other districts are Mirzapur and Balha from Uttar Pradesh and Mohindergarh from PEPSU In Mohindergarh the average debt owed to agriculturist moneylenders was Rs 417 per family accounting for 88 1 per cent of the total debt owed In 40 out of the 75 districts more than 50 per cent of the total debt was owed to professional moneylenders There are only 15 districts where only less than 20 per cent of the debt was owed to professional moneylenders This illustrates the importance of the professional money lenders in the provision of finance to non cultivators

18 4 14 Debt owed to traders was reported in 54 of the selected districts Generally the proportion of debt owed to the agency was small Only in four districts viz Malabar Ratnagiri Quilon and Malda more than 20 per cent of the total debt of non cultivators was owed to traders In Malabar where the average debt owed to traders was Rs 41 61 7 per cent of the total debt of non cultivators was owed to this agency The debt owed to traders formed 35 3 per cent 32 3 per cent and 22 7 per cent of the total debt respectively in Ratnagiri Quilon and Malda In Ratnagiri the average debt owed to the agency was Rs 65 per family, while in Quilon and Malda it was Rs 30 and Rs 18 respectively per family

18 5 INTER STATE AND REGIONAL VARIATIONS IN THE IMPORTANCE OF VARIOUS CREDIT AGENCIES NON CULTIVATORS

18 5 1 In table 18 13 we give state wise data on borrowings of non cultivators from each credit agency similar figures in respect of debt are given in table 18 14 As in the case of cultivators the States in which the investigations covered only one district each are not included in these tables and the discussions below It will be seen from table 18 13 that the proportion of borrowings from Government to the total borrowings was 9 8 per cent in Assam 5 0 per cent in Hyderabad 3 9 per cent in Madhya Pradesh and 3 8 per cent in West Bengal In all other States the proportion was relatively very low The proportion of debt owed to Government to the total debt of non cultivators was 29 0 per cent in West Bengal 12 7 per cent in Assam and 9 9 per cent in Madhya Pradesh Generally as compared to cultivators a relatively smaller proportion of the debt and borrowings of non cultivators was accounted for by Government

TABLE 18 13—AVERAGE BORROWINGS PER NON-CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY—STATE-WISE DATA

[Amount in rupees. Figures in brackets denote percentages to total borrowings]

State	Total borrowings	Government	Co-operatives	Relatives	Land lords ¹	Agriculturist money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Commercial banks	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Assam	61.4 (9.8)	6.0 (9.8)	()	38.2 (62.2)	()	12.5 (20.3)	0.6 (1.0)	4.1 (6.7)	- ()	0.1 (0.1)
West Bengal	39.1 (3.8)	1.5 (3.8)	0.1 (0.3)	13.4 (34.2)	0.1 (0.3)	0.7 (1.8)	19.9 (50.9)	3.2 (8.2)	- (-)	0.2 (0.5)
Bihar	65.6 (1.5)	1.0 (1.5)	- ()	4.8 (7.3)	10.1 (15.4)	4.6 (7.0)	44.8 (68.3)	- ()	- ()	0.3 (0.5)
Uttar Pradesh	82.8 (0.4)	0.3 (0.4)	1.0 (1.2)	13.1 (15.8)	3.1 (3.7)	22.2 (26.8)	35.0 (42.2)	6.2 (7.5)	0.1 (0.1)	1.9 (2.3)
Punjab	92.4 (1.1)	1.0 (1.1)	5.0 (5.4)	48.4 (52.4)	15.0 (16.2)	0.2 (0.2)	21.5 (23.3)	1.3 (1.4)	- ()	- (-)
PEPSU	214.8 (0.1)	0.1 (0.1)	- ()	16.1 (7.5)	24.1 (11.2)	145.9 (67.9)	22.6 (10.5)	4.4 (2.0)	1.5 (0.7)	0.1 (0.1)
Rajasthan	63.4 ()	- ()	- ()	1.9 (3.0)	- ()	- ()	61.4 (96.8)	- ()	0.1 (0.2)	- (0.1)
Madhya Bharat	75.8 (-)	- (-)	- ()	2.1 (2.8)	5.2 (6.9)	4.1 (5.4)	62.3 (82.2)	0.4 (0.5)	- (-)	1.7 (2.2)
Vindhya Pradesh	19.9 ()	- ()	- (0.1)	0.7 (3.5)	1.7 (8.5)	9.1 (45.7)	8.2 (41.2)	0.1 (0.5)	- (-)	0.1 (0.5)
Orissa	28.3 (0.7)	0.2 (0.7)	0.8 (2.8)	1.6 (5.7)	- (0.1)	1.4 (5.0)	23.2 (82.2)	0.4 (1.4)	0.2 (0.7)	0.4 (1.4)
Madhya Pradesh	28.3 (3.9)	1.1 (3.9)	0.5 (1.8)	4.9 (17.3)	1.0 (3.5)	2.6 (9.2)	15.1 (53.3)	1.6 (5.7)	- ()	1.5 (5.3)
Bombay	49.1 (0.4)	0.2 (0.4)	3.0 (6.1)	17.0 (34.6)	1.2 (2.4)	10.1 (20.6)	9.6 (19.6)	5.6 (11.4)	- ()	2.4 (4.9)
Hyderabad	64.3 (5.0)	3.2 (5.0)	1.0 (1.6)	7.5 (11.7)	0.6 (0.9)	12.5 (19.4)	36.7 (57.1)	1.9 (2.9)	- ()	0.9 (1.4)
Mysore	83.1 ()	- ()	0.2 (0.2)	13.5 (16.3)	3.2 (3.9)	42.9 (51.6)	14.3 (17.2)	7.6 (9.1)	0.6 (0.7)	0.8 (1.0)
Madras	74.9 (0.3)	0.2 (0.3)	0.8 (1.1)	4.7 (6.3)	2.3 (3.1)	29.4 (39.2)	15.0 (20.0)	16.8 (22.4)	3.6 (4.8)	2.1 (2.8)

¹ To tenants only

TABLE 18.14—AVERAGE DEBT PER NON-CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY—STATE-WISE DATA

[Amount in rupees Figures in brackets denote percentages to total debt]

State	Total debt	Government	Co-operatives and Commercial banks ¹	Relatives	Land lords	Agriculturist money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Assam	115.9	14.7 (12.7)	()	53.5 (46.2)	— (—)	29.8 (25.7)	13.7 (11.8)	4.1 (3.6)	— (—)
West Bengal	74.6	21.6 (29.0)	0.3 (0.4)	18.9 (25.3)	1.1 (1.5)	1.0 (1.4)	28.9 (38.7)	2.7 (3.6)	0.1 (0.1)
Bihar	112.4	0.8 (0.7)	0.1 ()	4.7 (4.2)	21.9 (19.5)	6.1 (5.4)	78.2 (69.5)	— ()	0.7 (0.6)
Uttar Pradesh	132.9	0.5 (0.4)	1.2 (0.9)	16.0 (12.0)	5.5 (4.1)	40.4 (30.4)	61.5 (46.3)	5.8 (4.4)	2.0 (1.5)
Punjab	204.6	3.9 (1.9)	9.8 (4.8)	72.2 (35.3)	42.6 (20.8)	0.3 (0.1)	71.4 (34.9)	4.3 (2.1)	0.1 (0.1)
PEPSU	728.3	5.1 (0.7)	1.5 (0.2)	27.9 (3.8)	138.2 (19.0)	429.6 (58.9)	121.7 (16.7)	5.2 (0.7)	0.1 (—)
Rajasthan	276.4	0.4 (0.1)	2.7 (1.0)	7.7 (2.8)	3.0 (1.1)	0.4 (0.1)	260.6 (94.3)	— ()	1.6 (0.6)
Madhya Bharat	111.1	0.1 (0.1)	1.2 (1.1)	3.9 (3.5)	6.6 (5.9)	4.9 (4.4)	92.0 (82.8)	0.3 (0.3)	2.1 (1.9)
Vindhya Pradesh	28.5	— ()	0.2 (0.7)	1.0 (3.5)	4.8 (16.8)	6.1 (21.4)	15.8 (55.3)	0.1 (0.2)	0.6 (2.1)
Orissa	44.2	0.5 (1.1)	1.3 (3.0)	2.0 (4.5)	0.5 (1.1)	3.4 (7.7)	36.1 (81.7)	0.4 (0.9)	— (—)
Madhya Pradesh	43.6	4.3 (9.9)	1.4 (3.2)	6.7 (15.4)	1.8 (4.1)	1.3 (3.0)	25.0 (57.3)	2.2 (5.0)	0.9 (2.1)
Bombay	132.2	2.4 (1.8)	4.8 (3.6)	35.4 (26.8)	3.4 (2.6)	12.5 (9.5)	47.3 (35.8)	24.4 (18.4)	2.0 (1.5)
Hyderabad	119.6	3.7 (3.1)	1.7 (1.4)	10.3 (8.6)	1.6 (1.3)	19.9 (16.6)	78.9 (66.0)	3.2 (2.7)	0.3 (0.3)
Mysore	186.2	3.3 (1.8)	2.8 (1.5)	19.1 (10.2)	4.8 (2.6)	126.8 (68.1)	22.3 (12.0)	4.7 (2.5)	2.4 (1.3)
Madras	139.3	0.5 (0.4)	4.4 (3.2)	8.4 (6.0)	0.9 (0.6)	56.2 (40.4)	42.1 (30.2)	25.0 (17.9)	1.8 (1.3)

¹ Separate data on debt owed to co-operatives and commercial banks are not available

18 5 2 Borrowings of non cultivators from co-operatives accounted for 6 1 per cent of their total borrowings in Bombay the corresponding proportion was 5 4 per cent in the Punjab 2 8 per cent in Orissa and less than 2 per cent in other States Thus except in Bombay and perhaps also in the Punjab a relatively very low proportion of the borrowings of non-cultivators was from co-operatives Commercial banks were not important in any of the State The proportion of borrowings from this agency to the total borrowings was the highest in Madras at 4 8 per cent

18 5 3 Relatives supplied substantial proportion of the credit in Assam West Bengal the Punjab and Bombay In most of the States borrowings from landlords formed a small proportion of the total borrowings Traders generally supplied a small proportion of the total borrowings in most of the States only less than 10 per cent of the borrowings were from this agency Agriculturist moneylenders supplied more than 50 per cent of the credit in PEPSU and Mysore In Vindhya Pradesh and Madras 40 7 per cent and 39 2 per cent of the total borrowings respectively were from this agency The professional moneylender was the important credit agency in many States More than 60 per cent of the borrowings were from professional moneylenders in Bihar Rajasthan Madhya Bharat and Orissa

18 5 4 In tables 18 15 and 18 16 the data relating to amounts borrowed from and debt owed to various agencies by non-cultivators in each of the 13 regions are presented As the data on borrowings and debt have already been discussed not only on a district basis but also on a State basis the comments might be restricted to only a few important characteristics of the data Relatives were important in the Assam Bengal and Punjab-PEPSU regions Agriculturist moneylenders supplied more than 40 per cent of the total credit to non-cultivators in North Deccan South Deccan and East Coast while professional moneylenders lent more than 60 per cent of the total credit in the Rajasthan Central India and Orissa and East Madhya Pradesh regions Traders were important only in West Coast Broadly, these correspond to the results noted in the case of cultivators As compared to other regions landlords were prominent in the Punjab-PEPSU and Central India regions while commercial banks were particularly important in the South Deccan and East Coast regions

18 5 5 Table 18 17 presents district wise data on borrowings of all families from various credit agencies table 18 18 gives similar data on debt owed by all families The State wise and regional averages of borrowings and debt of all families are presented in tables 18 19 to 18 22 No comments are offered on these data as the discussions on the data for cultivators and non-cultivators have fully brought out the relative importance of the various credit agencies.

TABLE 18.15—AVERAGE BORROWINGS PER NON-CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY—REGIONAL DATA

[Amount in rupees. Figures in brackets denote percentages to total borrowings]

Region	Total borrowings	Government	Co-operatives	Relatives	Land lords ¹	Agriculturist money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Commercial banks	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1 Assam Bengal	47 0	5 7 (12 1)	— (0 1)	25 5 (54 3)	— (0 1)	8 4 (17 9)	3 8 (8 1)	3 2 (6 8)	— (—)	0 3 (0 6)
2 Bihar Bengal	52 5	1 0 (1 9)	0 1 (0 2)	9 8 (18 7)	5 0 (9 5)	3 5 (6 7)	31 2 (59 4)	1 7 (3 2)	— ()	0 2 (0 4)
3 Eastern Uttar Pradesh	63 9	0 2 (0 3)	2 1 (3 3)	8 5 (13 3)	1 5 (2 3)	17 8 (27 9)	27 3 (42 7)	3 3 (5 2)	0 1 (0 2)	3 1 (4 8)
4 Western Uttar Pradesh	103 0	0 4 (0 4)	0 5 (0 5)	17 5 (17 0)	4 0 (3 9)	26 0 (25 2)	44 5 (43 2)	8 7 (8 4)	— (—)	1 4 (1 4)
5 Punjab PEPSU	114 9	0 8 (0 7)	4 0 (3 5)	42 0 (36 5)	16 7 (14 5)	27 7 (24 1)	21 5 (18 7)	1 8 (1 6)	0 3 (0 3)	0 1 (0 1)
6 Rajasthan	63 4	— (—)	— (—)	1 9 (3 0)	— (—)	— (—)	61 4 (96 8)	— (—)	0 1 (0 2)	— ()
7 Central India	51 3	1 2 (2 3)	— (—)	2 0 (3 9)	7 9 (15 4)	4 1 (8 0)	35 1 (68 4)	0 2 (0 4)	— ()	0 8 (1 6)
8 Orissa and East Madhya Pradesh	23 7	0 3 (1 3)	0 5 (2 1)	2 9 (12 2)	0 2 (0 8)	1 7 (7 2)	17 3 (73 0)	0 3 (1 3)	0 1 (0 4)	0 4 (1 7)
9 Western Cotton region	50 2	4 2 (8 4)	2 0 (4 0)	11 3 (22 4)	2 0 (4 0)	4 0 (8 0)	16 4 (32 7)	7 4 (14 7)	— (—)	2 9 (5 8)
10 North Deccan	74 5	0 1 (0 1)	1 6 (2 2)	9 3 (12 5)	0 6 (0 5)	32 2 (43 2)	26 0 (31 9)	3 6 (4 8)	— (—)	1 1 (1 5)
11 South Deccan	78 7	— (—)	0 8 (1 0)	6 7 (8 5)	1 5 (1 9)	32 7 (41 6)	29 6 (37 6)	2 3 (2 9)	2 5 (3 2)	2 6 (3 3)
12 East Coast	94 1	0 7 (0 7)	1 4 (1 5)	10 4 (11 1)	3 9 (4 1)	42 7 (45 4)	15 1 (16 1)	10 7 (11 4)	8 7 (9 2)	0 5 (0 5)
13 West Coast	60 1	— ()	0 6 (1 0)	5 4 (9 0)	1 8 (3 0)	6 2 (10 3)	10 7 (17 8)	32 2 (53 6)	0 8 (1 3)	2 4 (4 0)

¹ To tenants only

TABLE 18.16—AVERAGE DEBT PER NON-CULTIVATING FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY—REGIONAL DATA

[Amount in rupees Figures in brackets denote percentages to total debt]

Region	Total debt	Government	Co-operatives and commercial banks ¹	Relatives	Land lords	Agricultural money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1 Assam Bengal	88 1	11 9 (13 5)	1 7 (1 9)	37 2 (42 3)	0 1 (0 1)	19 8 (22 5)	14 2 (16 1)	3 1 (3 5)	0 1 (0 1)
2 Bihar Bengal	94 7	11 7 (12 4)	0 2 (0 2)	12 1 (12 5)	11 4 (12 0)	6 1 (6 4)	51 3 (54 2)	1 5 (1 6)	0 4 (0 4)
3 Eastern Uttar Pradesh	113 0	1 1 (1 0)	1 5 (1 3)	10 8 (9 6)	1 6 (1 4)	42 9 (38 0)	47 4 (41 9)	3 6 (3 2)	4 1 (3 6)
4 Western Uttar Pradesh	156 7	0 2 (0 1)	1 2 (0 8)	21 2 (13 5)	7 6 (4 9)	39 2 (25 0)	78 5 (50 1)	7 8 (5 0)	1 0 (0 6)
5 Punjab-PLPSU	302 4	4 0 (1 3)	8 1 (2 7)	63 7 (21 1)	60 4 (20 0)	81 1 (26 8)	80 7 (26 7)	4 4 (1 4)	0 1 ()
6 Rajasthan	276 3	0 4 (0 1)	2 7 (1 0)	7 6 (2 8)	3 0 (1 1)	0 4 (0 1)	260 6 (94 3)	— (—)	1 6 (0 6)
7 Central India	75 9	4 4 (5 8)	0 4 (0 5)	3 1 (4 1)	10 0 (13 2)	3 2 (4 2)	53 6 (70 6)	0 1 (0 1)	1 1 (1 5)
8 Orissa and East Madhya Pradesh	37 4	0 4 (1 1)	1 4 (3 7)	3 6 (9 6)	0 6 (1 6)	2 4 (6 4)	28 5 (76 2)	0 5 (1 3)	— (0 1)
9 Western Cotton region	87 7	7 5 (8 6)	2 8 (3 2)	18 6 (21 2)	4 4 (5 0)	2 2 (2 5)	36 6 (41 7)	13 0 (14 8)	2 6 (3 0)
10 North Deccan	145 2	1 9 (1 3)	3 3 (2 3)	13 7 (9 4)	0 7 (0 5)	60 3 (41 5)	57 7 (39 7)	7 5 (5 2)	0 1 (0 1)
11 South Deccan	172 8	0 8 (0 5)	6 1 (3 5)	13 0 (7 5)	1 6 (0 9)	81 5 (47 2)	64 7 (37 5)	4 5 (2 6)	0 6 (0 3)
12 East Coast	197 3	0 7 (0 4)	8 1 (4 1)	17 3 (8 3)	2 5 (1 3)	75 9 (38 4)	73 3 (37 1)	19 0 (9 6)	0 5 (0 3)
13 West Coast	82 3	— ()	1 2 (1 5)	8 7 (10 6)	0 5 (0 6)	8 1 (9 9)	19 7 (24 0)	39 9 (48 5)	4 0 (4 9)

¹ Separate data on debt owed to co-operatives and commercial banks are not available

TABLE 18.17—AVERAGE BORROWINGS PER FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY ALL FAMILIES

[Amount in rupees. Figures in brackets denote percentages to total borrowings]

State/District	Total borrowings	Government	Co-operatives	Relatives	Landlords	Agriculturist money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Commercial banks	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Assam										
Lakhimpur	65	-	()	25 (39.3)	-	11 (16.2)	29 (44.1)	-	-	- (0.4)
Cachar	88	9 (10.2)	1 (1.1)	52 (57.7)	()	23 (25.9)	-	-	-	2 (2.3)
Kamrup	142	8 (5.7)	()	103 (72.5)	(0.2)	21 (14.5)	3 (1.8)	6 (4.3)	-	1 (1.0)
Tripura										
Trinajura	106	44 (41.2)	-	26 (24.5)	-	12 (11.0)	18 (17.2)	4 (3.9)	-	2 (2.2)
West Bengal										
Jalpaiguri	78	1 (1.0)	-	23 (29.3)	34 (43.1)	-	12 (15.1)	1 (1.5)	-	- (0.5)
Malda	114	1 (0.7)	1 (0.6)	39 (34.6)	1 (0.6)	-	62 (54.6)	10 (8.7)	-	- (0.2)
Burdwan	96	5 (5.1)	1 (1.3)	20 (21.5)	(0.1)	7 (7.7)	52 (53.8)	-	-	-
Midnapore	104	1 (0.7)	2 (1.5)	33 (31.6)	()	-	68 (65.6)	1 (0.5)	-	- (0.1)
Bihar										
Bhagalpur	239	8 (3.5)	1 (0.2)	8 (3.2)	-	41 (17.4)	181 (75.7)	-	-	-
Monghyr	149	6 (3.9)	-	11 (7.1)	19 (12.4)	-	114 (76.2)	-	-	-
Hazaribagh	51	5 (9.3)	-	3 (6.6)	-	12 (23.7)	30 (58.6)	-	-	1 (1.0)
Palamau	109	1 (1.0)	-	1 (1.2)	-	-	106 (97.8)	-	-	-
Uttar Pradesh										
Muzaffarpur	97	14 (14.7)	3 (2.6)	3 (3.0)	2 (1.8)	58 (60.2)	8 (8.0)	9 (9.7)	-	-
Ballia	108	2 (1.4)	1 (0.7)	16 (13.5)	2 (1.6)	41 (38.2)	42 (39.1)	5 (4.9)	-	1 (0.6)
Deoria	273	-	16 (5.5)	6 (2.1)	4 (1.4)	71 (26.0)	171 (62.6)	-	-	6 (2.2)
Jaunpur	157	-	2 (1.0)	31 (19.9)	(0.2)	78 (49.8)	39 (24.5)	3 (2.1)	-	4 (2.2)
Sultanpur	89	()	2 (0.3)	29 (32.9)	-	6 (6.2)	21 (24.1)	6 (5.8)	-	26 (29.7)
Satapur	39	-	2 (3.9)	30 (76.7)	(0.1)	-	7 (19.0)	-	-	-
Kanpur	177	-	-	78 (44.0)	10 (5.5)	10 (5.5)	76 (43.0)	2 (1.2)	-	- (0.3)

1 To tenants only

TABLE 18.17—AVERAGE BORROWINGS PER FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY: ALL FAMILIES—Continued

[Amount in rupees. Figures in brackets denote percentages to total borrowings]

State District	Total borrowings	Government	Co-operatives	Relatives	Land lords ¹	Agriculturist money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Commercial banks	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Uttar Pradesh										
—concd										
Hamirpur	119	— (0 2)	1 (1 0)	16 (13 5)	19 (16 1)	— (0 4)	82 (68 4)	— (—)	— (—)	— (0 4)
Shahjahanpur	246	1 (0 6)	3 (1 2)	11 (4 5)	2 (0 9)	8 (3 3)	209 (85 2)	11 (4 2)	— (—)	— (—)
Agra	255	2 (0 6)	2 (0 6)	4 (1 6)	— (0 1)	9 (3 4)	237 (93 9)	— (0 2)	— (—)	2 (0 6)
Aligarh	148	— (—)	2 (1 3)	24 (16 5)	— (—)	— (—)	120 (80 6)	1 (1 0)	— (—)	1 (0 6)
Nainital	734	2 (0 3)	2 (0 2)	18 (2 5)	7 (0 9)	— (—)	165 (22 6)	3 (0 4)	5 (0 6)	503 (68 5)
Meerut	260	— (0 1)	2 (0 7)	82 (31 6)	2 (0 7)	128 (49 0)	10 (3 7)	36 (13 9)	— (—)	1 (0 3)
Himachal Pradesh										
Sirmoor	98	1 (0 7)	2 (2 0)	40 (41 0)	12 (12 6)	12 (12 0)	15 (15 6)	9 (9 0)	2 (2 6)	4 (4 5)
Punjab										
Hoshiarpur	201	50 (25 0)	10 (4 8)	108 (53 7)	15 (7 5)	— (—)	18 (9 0)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)
Jullundur	135	2 (1 5)	9 (6 6)	75 (55 6)	6 (4 6)	— (—)	42 (31 4)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)
Hissar	113	1 (0 6)	— (0 2)	32 (28 3)	7 (6 4)	2 (1 5)	69 (60 9)	2 (1 6)	— (0 1)	— (0 1)
PEPSU										
Bhatinda	363	1 (0 3)	— (—)	48 (13 2)	26 (7 2)	187 (51 6)	83 (23 5)	14 (3 9)	3 (0 8)	1 (0 2)
Mohindergarh	382	— (—)	— (—)	18 (4 8)	1 (0 2)	342 (89 6)	18 (4 7)	1 (0 1)	— (—)	2 (0 6)
Rajasthan										
Churu	131	— (—)	— (—)	13 (9 8)	1 (0 7)	— (—)	73 (56 0)	— (—)	— (—)	44 (33 5)
Barmer	249	1 (0 3)	— (—)	78 (31 2)	— (—)	— (—)	171 (68 5)	— (—)	— (—)	— (—)
Sirohi	27	— (0 1)	— (—)	2 (8 5)	1 (4 0)	— (—)	24 (89 3)	— (—)	— (0 6)	— (0 2)
Jaipur	273	— (—)	— (—)	23 (8 5)	— (—)	— (—)	249 (91 2)	— (—)	— (—)	1 (0 2)
Sawai Madhopur	312	6 (1 9)	— (—)	1 (5 3)	2 (0 7)	— (—)	285 (91 4)	— (—)	— (—)	2 (0 6)
Chittorgarh	168	— (0 2)	— (—)	18 (10 5)	1 (0 5)	— (—)	144 (85 7)	3 (1 9)	— (—)	2 (0 9)

¹ To tenants only

**TABLE 18 17—AVERAGE BORROWINGS PER FAMILY CLASSIFIED
ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY ALL FAMILIES—Continued**
[Amount in rupees. Figures in brack ts denote percentages to total borrowings]

State/District	Total bor- row- ings	Gov- ern- ment	Co- op- er- a- tives	Re- la- tives	Land lords	Agr- icul- ture at money lenders	Profes- sional money lenders	Traders and com- mission- agents	Com- mer- cial banks	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Madhya Bharat										
Jhabua	117	11 (9.7)	2 (1.7)	2 (1.4)	()	2 (1.5)	96 (82.0)	()	(0.1)	4 (3.6)
Shivpur	82	18 (2.0)	1 (1.0)	(0.1)	(0.3)	()	6 (7.5)	()	(1.2)	()
Shajapur	277	2 (0.7)	11 (3.8)	7 (2.7)	6 (2.2)	9 (3.2)	39 (86.4)	3 (1.0)	()	()
Bhilai	269	29 (10.6)	()	1 (4.5)	(2)	()	17 (76.9)	()	5 (1.8)	11 (4.0)
Bhopal										
Itanagar	118	1 (0.6)	()	17 (14.3)	70 (59.1)	()	29 (24.2)	(0.2)	()	2 (1.6)
Vindhya Pradesh										
Satna	59	(0.1)	(0.1)	1 (0.9)	1 (1.6)	51 (86.3)	4 (7.5)	1 (0.9)	()	2 (2.6)
Rewa	83	1 (1.5)	()	1 (0.8)	(2.0)	21 (25.6)	56 (67.9)	(0.4)	1 (1.7)	(0.1)
Orissa										
Sambalpur	58	(0.6)	()	3 (5.4)	(0.1)	9 (16.3)	45 (77.5)	()	()	(0.1)
Puri	90	1 (1.3)	1 (4.3)	7 (8.0)	(0.1)	()	75 (83.4)	1 (1.0)	(0.9)	2 (1.7)
Koraput	21	()	(1.0)	1 (4.2)	()	()	1 (91.8)	()	()	()
Madhya Pradesh										
Bilaspur	75	1 (0.9)	6 (8.4)	12 (15.4)	()	39 (52.0)	23 (30.9)	()	()	9 (12.4)
Durg	54	5 (9.7)	1 (1.4)	4 (6.9)	()	20 (54.1)	15 (27.7)	()	()	(0.2)
Chandla	109	7 (6.5)	(0.4)	20 (24.2)	9 (10.1)	9 (10.1)	66 (60.4)	4 (3.5)	9 (1.5)	1 (1.0)
Nagpur	119	7 (5.9)	6 (5.9)	28 (23.6)	3 (2.4)	()	50 (41.5)	15 (12.7)	()	10 (8.7)
Sagar	384	87 (22.6)	5 (1.3)	26 (6.7)	()	5 (1.3)	250 (66.6)	()	()	6 (1.5)
Akola	86	1 (0.8)	5 (6.2)	1 (1.3)	4 (5.1)	3 (3.6)	33 (39.8)	5 (5.6)	1 (1.3)	9 (1.9)
Saurashtra										
Sorath	207	18 (7.3)	()	9 (10.4)	()	(0.1)	144 (69.6)	25 (12.1)	1 (0.4)	(0.1)
Bombay										
Amreli	234	20 (8.6)	14 (6.1)	81 (34.8)	3 (1.1)	(0.9)	74 (31.6)	39 (16.0)	()	4 (1.6)
Dahanu	190	1 (0.6)	87 (30.3)	49 (25.9)	9 (4.8)	()	22 (11.6)	26 (13.6)	()	25 (13.2)

1 To tenants only

**TABLE 18.17—AVERAGE BORROWINGS PER FAMILY CLASSIFIED
ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY: ALL FAMILIES—Concluded**

[Amount in rupees. Figures in brackets denote percentages to total borrowings]

State District	Total bor- row- ings	Gov- ern- ment	Co- op- era- tives	Reli- gious	Land lords	Agri- cul- ture money lenders	Protes- tional money lenders	Traders and com- mune own agents	Com- mer- cial banks	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Bombay—conold										
West Khandesh	169	5 (3.2)	34 (20.0)	47 (27.9)	(-)	28 (16.4)	29 (16.9)	11 (6.5)	15 (8.8)	- (-)
Poona	141	15 (10.4)	28 (19.6)	22 (15.7)	1 (0.9)	6 (4.3)	41 (29.0)	13 (9.0)	12 (8.5)	1 (.7)
Ratnagiri	39	-	3 (7.0)	14 (35.9)	-	-	15 (39.0)	4 (9.4)	1 (2.1)	1 (3.2)
Kolhapur	89	-	18 (20.3)	16 (17.9)	1 (0.7)	-	47 (52.9)	5 (6.0)	1 (1.2)	- (-)
Bijapur	166	1 (0.4)	8 (5.1)	34 (20.6)	(0.1)	102 (61.6)	6 (3.5)	14 (3.2)	- (0.1)	- (0.1)
Hyderabad										
Osmanabad	142	2 (1.7)	1 (0.5)	38 (26.5)	1 (0.4)	76 (53.8)	10 (7.3)	12 (8.5)	- (-)	2 (1.3)
Parbhani	108	7 (6.9)	1 (0.9)	16 (15.1)	12 (10.9)	9 (8.1)	42 (39.1)	18 (16.4)	- (-)	3 (2.6)
Nizamabad	151	3 (1.8)	5 (3.1)	6 (4.1)	1 (0.3)	55 (36.5)	48 (31.6)	31 (20.4)	- (-)	3 (2.2)
Mahbubnagar	190	3 (1.5)	1 (0.5)	4 (2.2)	1 (0.4)	13 (6.8)	166 (87.3)	2 (1.3)	- (-)	- (-)
Mysore										
Hassan	155	- (-)	- (0.2)	1 (0.5)	1 (0.5)	127 (82.1)	- (-)	20 (12.9)	5 (3.3)	- (-)
Bangalore	193	- (-)	- (-)	16 (8.5)	3 (1.5)	142 (73.2)	23 (11.9)	2 (1.2)	- (-)	2 (3.7)
Madras										
Coimbatore	250	1 (0.3)	9 (3.5)	7 (3.0)	3 (1.0)	106 (42.5)	100 (39.9)	2 (0.7)	21 (8.6)	1 (0.3)
Cuddapah	372	9 (2.4)	6 (1.6)	1 (0.3)	-	228 (61.1)	124 (33.4)	- (-)	1 (0.3)	3 (0.8)
Kurnool	364	1 (0.2)	13 (3.6)	6 (1.7)	1 (0.2)	240 (65.0)	75 (20.6)	25 (6.9)	1 (0.4)	1 (0.4)
West Godavari	341	6 (1.7)	10 (2.9)	14 (4.0)	1 (0.1)	215 (59.6)	63 (17.3)	35 (9.6)	15 (4.2)	2 (0.6)
Chingleput	230	24 (10.3)	1 (0.3)	20 (8.5)	7 (3.2)	104 (44.9)	67 (28.9)	3 (1.5)	5 (2.1)	- (0.1)
Ramanathapuram	133	8 (6.3)	1 (0.7)	1 (0.9)	-	114 (85.8)	3 (2.2)	5 (4.0)	- (0.1)	- (-)
Malabar	347	- (0.1)	2 (0.6)	10 (2.8)	1 (0.1)	87 (24.9)	28 (5.2)	100 (37.3)	2 (0.6)	10 (2.4)
Travancore- Cochin										
Quilon	219	- (-)	9 (4.3)	46 (20.9)	3 (1.3)	- (-)	72 (33.0)	69 (31.5)	13 (6.1)	6 (2.9)

* To tenants only

**TABLE 18 18—AVERAGE DEBT PER FAMILY CLASSIFIED
ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY, ALL FAMILIES**

[Amount in rupees Figures in brackets denote percentages to total debt]

State District	Total debt	Govern- ment	Co opera- tives and com- mercial banks ¹	Re- la- tives	Land lords	Agri- culti- vist money lenders	Profes- sional money lenders	Traders and com- mis- sion agents	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Assam									
Lakhimpur	64	— (—)	1 (2 1)	26 (41 2)	— (—)	8 (12 4)	28 (44 2)	— (—)	— (0 1)
Cachar	137	17 (12 6)	2 (1 4)	82 (60 3)	— (—)	33 (24 4)	1 (0 8)	— ()	1 (0 5)
Kamrup	291	35 (12 0)	— (—)	156 (53 8)	— (0 1)	50 (17 2)	30 (10 4)	15 (5 3)	4 (1 2)
Tripura									
Tripura	173	89 (51 6)	5 (3 0)	29 (17 0)	2 (1 1)	18 (10 6)	23 (13 0)	5 (2 6)	2 (1 1)
West Bengal									
Jalpaiguri	75	2 (2 1)	— (0 4)	30 (40 1)	27 (35 5)	— (—)	16 (21 1)	— (0 3)	— (0 5)
Malda	111	2 (2 2)	1 (0 4)	42 (37 4)	1 (0 5)	— (0 2)	56 (50 6)	10 (8 7)	— ()
Burdwan	208	55 (26 6)	2 (0 8)	49 (23 5)	5 (2 2)	10 (4 7)	87 (42 0)	— (0 1)	— (0 1)
Midnapore	126	1 (0 8)	2 (1 8)	41 (32 3)	1 (0 5)	— (—)	81 (64 4)	— (0 2)	— ()
Bihar									
Bhagalpur	363	10 (2 7)	3 (0 9)	4 (1 2)	— ()	65 (17 9)	282 (77 3)	— ()	— (—)
Monghyr	267	11 (4 3)	1 (0 4)	13 (4 8)	47 (17 8)	— (—)	194 (72 6)	— ()	1 (0 2)
Hazaribagh	88	5 (5 3)	1 (0 7)	6 (6 9)	— (—)	13 (14 4)	64 (72 4)	— ()	— (0 3)
Palamau	172	1 (0 7)	— (0 2)	6 (3 2)	1 (0 6)	— (—)	164 (95 3)	— ()	— (—)
Uttar Pradesh									
Muzaffarpur	158	17 (10 7)	4 (2 7)	3 (1 9)	3 (1 7)	91 (57 5)	19 (12 3)	17 (10 8)	4 (2 4)
Balla	264	2 (0 8)	1 (0 4)	22 (8 2)	7 (2 5)	126 (47 6)	96 (36 4)	10 (4 0)	— (0 1)
Deoria	484	1 (0 2)	16 (3 2)	7 (1 5)	3 (0 7)	81 (16 6)	374 (77 0)	— (0 1)	3 (0 7)
Jaunpur	250	— (0 2)	2 (0 8)	41 (16 6)	1 (0 2)	142 (56 6)	55 (22 0)	3 (1 2)	6 (2 4)
Sultanpur	149	1 (0 4)	1 (0 4)	31 (21 0)	1 (0 9)	8 (5 5)	71 (47 9)	5 (3 3)	31 (20 6)
Sitapur	35	— (0 1)	2 (3 8)	31 (57 0)	4 (8 1)	— (—)	17 (30 9)	— (0 1)	— ()
Kanpur	215	— (0 2)	— (0 2)	84 (39 2)	13 (6 1)	10 (4 8)	103 (47 7)	4 (1 6)	— (0 2)

¹ Separate data on debt owed to co-operatives and commercial banks are not available

TABLE 18.18—AVERAGE DEBT PER FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY: ALL FAMILIES—Continued

[Amount in rupees. Figures in brackets denote percentages to total debt]

State District	Total debt	Government	Co-operatives and commercial banks ¹	Relatives	Land lords	Agriculturist money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Uttar Pradesh—Contd									
Hamirpur	218	- (-)	2 (1 2)	15 (6 9)	39 (17 7)	1 (0 2)	161 (73 8)	- (0 1)	- (0 1)
Shahjahanpur	235	4 (1 8)	31 (13 2)	13 (5 7)	1 (0 3)	9 (3 9)	169 (71 7)	8 (3 2)	- (0 2)
Agra	407	1 (0 3)	3 (0 8)	5 (1 2)	- (-)	2 (0 6)	393 (96 6)	- (-)	2 (0 5)
Aligarh	208	- (0 1)	2 (1 0)	30 (14 7)	- (0 1)	- (-)	173 (83 4)	1 (0 3)	1 (0 4)
Nainital	1,059	3 (0 4)	564 (53 2)	62 (5 9)	19 (1 8)	- (-)	406 (38 3)	4 (0 3)	1 (0 1)
Meerut	331	1 (0 2)	3 (1 0)	80 (24 2)	6 (1 9)	177 (53 4)	23 (6 9)	40 (12 2)	1 (0 2)
Himachal Pradesh									
Sirmoor	206	- (-)	7 (3 2)	57 (27 8)	28 (13 8)	23 (11 0)	79 (38 4)	9 (4 4)	3 (1 4)
Punjab									
Hoshiarpur	291	32 (10 9)	14 (4 9)	151 (51 9)	44 (15 3)	- (-)	46 (15 8)	3 (1 1)	- (0 1)
Jullundur	282	11 (3 8)	15 (5 5)	104 (36 8)	64 (22 7)	- (0 1)	87 (31 0)	- (0 1)	- (-)
Hissar	344	3 (0 7)	2 (0 7)	60 (17 6)	17 (5 0)	3 (0 8)	253 (73 6)	1 (0 3)	5 (1 3)
PEPSU									
Bhatinda	1,169	6 (0 5)	6 (0 5)	80 (6 9)	275 (23 5)	577 (49 4)	207 (17 7)	13 (1 1)	4 (0 4)
Mohindergarh	822	- (-)	1 (0 1)	28 (3 4)	1 (0 1)	701 (85 2)	90 (10 9)	1 (0 1)	1 (0 2)
Rajasthan									
Churu	223	- (0 1)	- (0 1)	25 (11 2)	5 (2 3)	2 (0 9)	116 (51 9)	5 (2 0)	70 (31 5)
Barmer	495	2 (0 4)	4 (0 8)	167 (33 7)	4 (0 9)	- (-)	318 (64 2)	- (-)	- (-)
Sirohi	349	- (-)	8 (2 3)	7 (2 0)	6 (1 6)	- (-)	265 (76 0)	- (-)	63 (18 1)
Jaipur ..	601	- (-)	2 (0 3)	47 (7 7)	- (-)	- (-)	554 (92 0)	- (-)	- (-)
Sawai Madhopur	593	3 (0 5)	4 (0 6)	37 (6 2)	7 (1 2)	- (-)	538 (90 9)	- (-)	4 (0 6)
Chittorgarh	404	2 (0 5)	3 (0 6)	25 (6 1)	- (-)	2 (0 6)	369 (91 4)	3 (0 8)	- (-)

¹ Separate data on debt owed to co-operatives and commercial banks are not available

TABLE 18.18—AVERAGE DEBT PER FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY ALL FAMILIES—Continued

[Amount in rupees Figures in brackets denote percentages to total debt]

State District	Total debt	Government	Co operatives and commercial banks ¹	Rola tives	Land lords	Agri cultu rist money lenders	Profes sional money lenders	Ira ders and com mis sion agents	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Madhya Bharat									
Jhabua	192	8 (4.1)	3 (1.7)	3 (1.6)	()	— (0.2)	152 (79.3)	— ()	25 (12.1)
Shivpur	227	22 (9.6)	3 (1.2)	3 (1.3)	10 (4.4)	()	190 (83.5)	(—) (—)	()
Shajapur	292	5 (1.6)	20 (7.0)	9 (3.0)	6 (2.0)	10 (3.3)	241 (82.6)	2 (0.5)	(—)
Bhilsa	362	29 (8.1)	17 (4.8)	34 (9.3)	19 (5.2)	— ()	249 (69.0)	1 (0.2)	12 (3.5)
Bhopal									
Raisen	152	7 (4.8)	— (0.1)	20 (12.8)	75 (49.3)	— ()	49 (32.0)	1 (0.9)	— (0.1)
Vindhya Pradesh									
Sitna	63	— (0.1)	1 (1.6)	3 (4.9)	12 (19.1)	34 (54.6)	12 (18.2)	1 (0.8)	— (0.7)
Bewa	121	1 (1.2)	— (—)	1 (1.2)	5 (3.8)	18 (15.0)	95 (78.2)	1 (0.4)	— (0.2)
Orissa									
Sambalpur	73	7 (10.1)	— (0.3)	6 (8.1)	— (0.1)	17 (22.8)	42 (55.5)	— ()	— (0.1)
Puri	127	2 (1.5)	6 (4.5)	12 (9.6)	3 (2.1)	— (0.2)	102 (80.2)	2 (1.9)	— (—)
Koraput	29	2 (7.9)	— (0.6)	1 (3.2)	()	(—)	25 (86.9)	— (1.4)	— (—)
Madhya Pradesh									
Bilaspur	131	1 (0.6)	5 (4.1)	10 (7.5)	— ()	40 (30.5)	75 (57.2)	— ()	— (0.1)
Durg	68	5 (7.8)	2 (3.4)	4 (5.6)	— (—)	13 (19.3)	43 (63.9)	— (—)	— (—)
Chanda	180	13 (7.5)	12 (6.9)	33 (15.5)	4 (2.0)	— (0.1)	109 (60.6)	8 (4.4)	— (—)
Nagpur	158	25 (16.0)	9 (5.8)	39 (24.4)	4 (2.7)	— (0.1)	63 (37.0)	17 (10.8)	5 (3.2)
Sagar	430	152 (35.3)	8 (1.3)	27 (6.3)	— ()	8 (1.9)	234 (54.5)	— (—)	3 (0.7)
Akola	103	1 (1.1)	5 (5.2)	14 (13.1)	13 (12.2)	5 (4.8)	59 (56.7)	6 (6.2)	1 (0.7)
Saurashtra									
Sorath	227	21 (9.1)	— (—)	24 (10.5)	— (—)	— (—)	167 (73.5)	15 (6.8)	— (0.1)
Bombay									
Ahmedabad	540	70 (12.9)	24 (4.4)	142 (26.3)	40 (7.5)	1 (0.2)	160 (29.6)	96 (17.8)	7 (1.3)
Broach	347	32 (9.2)	50 (17.0)	69 (20.0)	37 (10.6)	— (0.1)	84 (24.1)	41 (11.8)	25 (7.2)

¹ Separate data on debt owed to co operatives and commercial banks are not available

TABLE 18 18—AVERAGE DEBT PER FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY: ALL FAMILIES—Concluded

[Amount in rupees. Figures in brackets denote percentages to total debt]

State District	Total debt	Government	Co-operatives and commercial banks ¹	Relatives	Land lords	Agricultural money lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Bombay—Concld									
West Khandesh	251	35 (13.9)	62 (24.9)	52 (20.5)	11 (4.3)	17 (6.7)	62 (24.8)	12 (4.7)	- (0.1)
Poona	330	38 (11.5)	57 (15.7)	51 (15.6)	2 (0.5)	- (-)	145 (44.0)	42 (12.7)	- (-)
Ratnagiri	186	5 (2.7)	19 (10.4)	54 (28.9)	10 (5.6)	- (-)	70 (37.6)	27 (14.4)	1 (0.4)
Kolhapur	180	- (0.2)	19 (10.5)	27 (15.1)	6 (3.2)	- (0.2)	122 (67.6)	6 (3.2)	- (-)
Bijapur	233	14 (5.8)	16 (7.0)	41 (17.6)	1 (0.3)	120 (51.5)	15 (6.4)	27 (11.4)	- (-)
Hyderabad									
Osmanabad	221	3 (1.3)	1 (0.6)	54 (24.4)	1 (0.5)	120 (54.2)	23 (10.4)	17 (7.9)	2 (0.7)
Parbhani	117	7 (5.6)	2 (1.6)	17 (14.3)	12 (10.4)	6 (4.8)	59 (50.5)	14 (12.3)	1 (0.5)
Nizamabad	263	15 (5.5)	9 (3.4)	8 (3.0)	2 (0.6)	91 (34.5)	103 (39.1)	32 (12.3)	4 (1.6)
Mahbubnagar	271	5 (1.8)	2 (0.9)	5 (2.0)	- (0.1)	16 (5.9)	240 (88.4)	2 (0.9)	- (-)
Mysore									
Hassan	415	4 (0.9)	10 (2.4)	1 (0.3)	3 (0.6)	367 (88.3)	- (0.1)	30 (7.2)	1 (0.2)
Bangalore	383	- (-)	- (0.1)	35 (9.0)	8 (2.1)	293 (76.6)	32 (8.4)	2 (0.6)	12 (3.2)
Madras									
Coimbatore	607	8 (1.4)	38 (6.3)	20 (3.3)	1 (0.2)	206 (33.9)	331 (54.5)	2 (0.3)	- (0.1)
Cuddapah	677	11 (1.6)	12 (1.8)	8 (1.1)	2 (0.2)	452 (66.8)	183 (27.5)	3 (0.4)	2 (0.3)
Kurnool	623	2 (0.2)	26 (4.2)	10 (1.6)	1 (0.2)	410 (66.0)	125 (20.0)	46 (7.4)	3 (0.5)
West Godavari	535	6 (1.2)	22 (4.1)	23 (6.1)	- (-)	317 (59.3)	107 (20.0)	4 (.8)	2 (0.4)
Chingleput	418	37 (8.7)	21 (4.9)	29 (7.0)	6 (1.3)	143 (34.3)	180 (43.2)	2 (0.5)	- (0.1)
Ramanathapuram	599	9 (1.5)	8 (1.4)	4 (0.6)	- (-)	461 (77.1)	23 (3.9)	93 (15.5)	1 (-)
Malabar	531	1 (0.1)	5 (1.0)	13 (2.5)	19 (3.6)	137 (25.8)	91 (17.2)	235 (44.2)	30 (5.6)
Travancore-Cochin									
Quilon	239	- (-)	20 (8.3)	46 (19.1)	3 (1.2)	1 (0.2)	114 (48.0)	48 (20.0)	8 (3.2)

¹ Separate data on debt owed to co-operatives and commercial banks are not available

**TABLE 18.19—AVERAGE BORROWINGS PER FAMILY CLASSIFIED
ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY. ALL FAMILIES—STATE-
WISE DATA**

[Amount in rupees. Figures in brackets denote percentages to total borrowings]

State	Total borro- wings	Govern- ment	Co opera- tives	Rela- tives	Land lords ¹	Agri- culti- st money lenders	Profi- tional money lenders	Tra- ders and com- mis- sion agents	Com- mer- cial banks	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Assam	106.1	7.2 (6.8)	0.4 (0.4)	69.2 (65.2)	— ()	19.1 (18.0)	6.9 (6.5)	1.8 (1.7)	— (—)	1.5 (1.4)
West Bengal	88.9	1.9 (2.1)	1.0 (1.2)	28.9 (32.5)	2.4 (2.7)	1.8 (2.0)	51.1 (57.4)	1.7 (2.0)	— (—)	0.1 (0.1)
Bihar	133.2	5.6 (4.2)	0.1 (0.1)	7.8 (5.8)	8.8 (6.6)	9.3 (7.0)	101.1 (75.9)	— (—)	— (—)	0.6 (0.4)
Uttar Pradesh	173.1	1.4 (0.8)	3.5 (2.0)	28.5 (16.5)	2.9 (1.7)	38.6 (22.3)	87.8 (50.7)	6.3 (3.6)	0.2 (0.1)	4.0 (2.3)
Punjab	166.8	19.9 (11.9)	7.5 (4.5)	80.4 (48.2)	9.6 (5.8)	0.7 (0.4)	48.2 (28.9)	0.6 (0.3)	0.1 (—)	— ()
P.P.F.S.U.	362.2	0.8 (0.2)	— (—)	30.0 (9.9)	16.3 (4.5)	235.9 (66.0)	58.3 (16.1)	9.3 (2.5)	1.6 (0.5)	1.0 (0.3)
Rajasthan	228.5	1.4 (0.6)	— (—)	22.9 (10.1)	1.0 (0.4)	— (—)	197.7 (86.5)	0.8 (0.3)	— ()	4.7 (2.1)
Madhya Bharat	166.2	12.6 (7.6)	3.5 (2.1)	4.3 (2.6)	2.7 (1.6)	3.0 (1.8)	135.9 (81.7)	0.8 (0.5)	0.9 (0.6)	2.5 (1.5)
Vindhya Pradesh	76.5	0.8 (1.0)	— (—)	0.9 (1.2)	1.2 (1.6)	34.9 (45.7)	36.8 (48.2)	0.3 (0.4)	0.8 (1.0)	0.7 (0.9)
Orissa	66.1	0.9 (1.3)	1.7 (2.6)	4.5 (6.8)	0.1 (0.1)	3.3 (5.0)	54.7 (82.9)	0.1 (0.2)	0.1 (0.1)	0.7 (1.0)
Madhya Pradesh	116.4	13.9 (11.9)	3.5 (3.0)	15.2 (13.1)	1.2 (1.1)	15.6 (13.4)	61.1 (52.4)	2.9 (2.5)	0.4 (0.4)	2.6 (2.2)
Bombay	134.6	5.5 (4.1)	20.2 (15.0)	33.7 (25.0)	1.4 (1.0)	21.8 (16.2)	30.5 (22.7)	13.7 (10.2)	2.9 (2.1)	4.9 (3.7)
Hyderabad	145.9	3.5 (2.4)	1.5 (1.0)	14.5 (9.9)	4.1 (2.8)	31.6 (21.7)	75.7 (51.9)	13.4 (9.2)	— (—)	1.5 (1.1)
Mysore	179.6	— (—)	— (—)	11.7 (5.5)	2.5 (1.4)	135.4 (75.4)	15.5 (8.7)	8.1 (4.5)	1.7 (0.9)	4.7 (2.6)
Madras	246.6	4.9 (2.0)	5.1 (2.1)	7.3 (3.0)	1.8 (0.7)	121.1 (49.1)	54.7 (22.2)	40.6 (16.5)	7.0 (2.8)	4.1 (1.6)

¹ For tenants only

TABLE 18.20—AVERAGE DEBT PER FAMILY CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY: ALL FAMILIES—STATE-WISE DATA

[Amount in rupees. Figures in brackets denote percentages to total debt]

State	Total debt	Government	Co-operatives and commercial banks ¹	Relatives	Land lords	Agriculturist money-lenders	Professional money lenders	Traders and commission agents	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Assam	191 5	24 0 (12 6)	1 0 (0 5)	106 3 (55 5)	0 2 (0 1)	32 9 (17 2)	18 0 (9 4)	6 9 (3 6)	2 1 (1 1)
West Bengal	127 0	16 0 (12 6)	1 5 (1 2)	37 5 (29 5)	3 4 (2 7)	2 4 (1 9)	64 7 (50 9)	1 4 (1 1)	0 1 (0 1)
Bihar	225 2	8 5 (3 8)	1 4 (0 6)	9 4 (4 2)	22 6 (10 0)	12 8 (5 7)	170 1 (75 5)	— (—)	0 4 (0 2)
Uttar Pradesh	273 2	2 0 (0 7)	8 8 (3 2)	32 9 (12 1)	5 5 (2 0)	58 5 (21 4)	151 0 (56 4)	7 3 (2 7)	4 2 (1 5)
Punjab	341 6	16 7 (4 9)	12 3 (3 6)	115 6 (33 8)	48 9 (14 3)	1 0 (0 3)	143 7 (42 1)	1 5 (0 4)	1 9 (0 6)
PEPSU	1,024 0	3 6 (0 4)	3 8 (0 4)	59 6 (5 8)	170 7 (16 7)	613 4 (59 9)	181 2 (15 7)	8 6 (0 8)	3 1 (0 3)
Rajasthan	497 2	1 3 (0 3)	2 9 (0 6)	45 5 (9 1)	2 9 (0 6)	0 6 (0 1)	432 5 (87 0)	1 2 (0 2)	10 2 (2 1)
Madhya Bharat	245 4	13 4 (5 4)	9 5 (3 9)	9 1 (3 7)	7 3 (3 0)	2 9 (1 2)	194 9 (79 4)	0 5 (0 2)	7 8 (3 2)
Vindhya Pradesh	102 0	0 9 (0 9)	0 3 (0 3)	2 4 (2 4)	7 7 (7 5)	25 8 (25 3)	63 8 (62 5)	0 7 (0 7)	0 4 (0 4)
Orissa.	89 9	4 6 (5 1)	2 8 (3 1)	7 5 (8 3)	1 2 (1 4)	5 8 (6 5)	66 8 (74 3)	1 1 (1 3)	— (—)
Madhya Pradesh.	154 1	25 0 (16 2)	5 7 (3 7)	17 5 (11 4)	2 9 (1 9)	12 5 (8 1)	85 5 (55 5)	3 9 (2 5)	1 1 (0 7)
Bombay	277 2	24 2 (8 7)	33 9 (12 2)	58 4 (21 1)	12 2 (4 4)	22 5 (8 1)	89 2 (32 2)	33 6 (12 1)	3 2 (1 2)
Hyderabad	212 9	6 1 (2 9)	3 1 (1 5)	18 9 (8 9)	4 6 (2 1)	46 4 (21 8)	119 1 (55 9)	13 4 (6 3)	1 2 (0 6)
Mysore	390 6	0 9 (0 2)	3 4 (0 9)	23 7 (6 1)	6 4 (1 6)	314 7 (80 6)	22 5 (5 8)	10 7 (2 7)	8 3 (2 1)
Madras . .	483 1	8 3 (1 7)	17 0 (3 5)	14 5 (3 0)	3 8 (0 8)	234 4 (48 5)	139 1 (28 8)	60 4 (12 5)	5 6 (1 2)

¹ Separate data on debt owed to co-operatives and commercial banks are not available

**TABLE 1821—AVERAGE BORROWINGS PER FAMILY CLASSIFIED
ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY ALL FAMILIES—
REGIONAL DATA**

[Amount in rupees Figures in brackets denote percentages to total borrowings]

Region	Total borrowings	Government	Co- opera- tives	Rela- tives	Land lords ¹	Agri- cultural money lenders	Profe- ssional money lenders	Traders and com- mission agents	Com- mer- cial banks	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1 Assam Bengal	98.9	10.8 (10.9)	0.4 (0.4)	56.2 (56.9)	3.8 (3.9)	15.1 (15.3)	9.2 (9.3)	1.9 (1.9)	()	1.4 (1.4)
2 Bihar Bengal	113.1	4.4 (3.9)	0.8 (0.7)	17.8 (15.7)	4.5 (4.0)	9.1 (8.1)	74.8 (66.1)	1.4 (1.2)	- ()	0.3 (0.3)
3 Eastern Uttar Pradesh	143.3	0.4 (0.3)	4.9 (3.4)	19.6 (13.7)	1.5 (1.0)	41.1 (28.7)	66.5 (46.4)	2.3 (1.6)	0.1 (0.1)	6.9 (4.8)
4 Western Uttar Pradesh	210.2	0.7 (0.3)	2.0 (1.0)	41.0 (19.5)	4.6 (2.2)	31.2 (14.9)	119.6 (56.9)	10.1 (4.8)	0.1 ()	0.8 (0.4)
5 Punjab PLI & U	217.6	14.6 (6.7)	5.3 (2.4)	68.5 (31.5)	11.0 (5.1)	63.3 (29.1)	50.4 (23.2)	3.3 (1.5)	0.6 (0.3)	0.5 (0.2)
6 Rajasthan	227.6	1.4 (0.6)	()	0.8 (10.0)	1.0 (0.4)	()	196.9 (86.5)	0.8 (0.4)	()	4.7 (0.2)
7 Central India	175.2	0.6 (1.9)	2.4 (1.4)	8.6 (4.9)	7.4 (4.2)	13.0 (7.4)	117.5 (67.1)	0.5 (0.3)	0.6 (0.3)	2.6 (1.5)
8 Orissa and East Madhya Pradesh	68.7	0.3 (3.3)	0.2 (3.2)	8.3 (12.1)	0.3 (0.4)	11.0 (16.3)	42.9 (62.5)	0.5 (0.7)	0.0 (0.3)	0.8 (1.0)
9 Western Cotton region	160.1	7.7 (4.8)	17.0 (10.6)	36.5 (22.8)	5.0 (3.1)	10.9 (6.8)	55.1 (34.4)	10.2 (1.0)	3.0 (1.9)	5.7 (3.6)
10 North Deccan	209.6	4.8 (2.3)	14.3 (6.8)	0.6 (10.3)	0.8 (0.4)	81.4 (38.9)	68.3 (32.6)	14.3 (6.8)	1.3 (0.6)	0.8 (1.3)
11 South Deccan	196.7	1.3 (0.7)	3.7 (1.9)	7.9 (4.0)	1.6 (0.8)	108.5 (55.2)	59.5 (30.2)	3.3 (1.7)	8.1 (4.1)	2.8 (1.4)
12 East Coast	200.6	8.5 (4.2)	3.0 (1.8)	10.3 (5.1)	0.7 (1.4)	114.1 (56.9)	38.5 (19.0)	15.5 (7.7)	6.2 (3.1)	1.2 (0.6)
13 West Coast	147.1	0.1 (0.1)	3.4 (2.3)	10.4 (10.5)	1.5 (1.0)	0.7 (14.1)	27.3 (18.8)	69.9 (46.8)	3.5 (2.4)	6.3 (4.3)

¹ To tenants only

**TABLE 18.22—AVERAGE DEBT OWED PER FAMILY CLASSIFIED
ACCORDING TO CREDIT AGENCY: ALL FAMILIES—
REGIONAL DATA**

[Amount in rupees. Figures in brackets denote percentages to total debt]

Region	Total debt	Government	Co opera tives and com mer cial banks ¹	Rela tives	Land lord	Agri cultural money lenders	Profes sional money lenders	Traders and com mission agents	Others
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1 Assam-Bengal	168.3	28.5 (16.9)	1.2 (0.7)	33.0 (19.7)	3.5 (2.1)	25.7 (15.3)	15.4 (9.1)	5.5 (3.3)	1.0 (.6)
2 Bihar-Bengal	180.8	15.8 (8.7)	1.7 (0.9)	22.8 (12.6)	12.0 (6.6)	13.7 (7.6)	115.5 (63.9)	1.8 (1.0)	0.5 (.3)
3 Eastern Uttar Pradesh	255.4	1.0 (0.4)	5.5 (2.1)	23.7 (9.3)	2.8 (1.1)	67.9 (26.6)	144.1 (56.4)	3.2 (1.3)	7.1 (2.8)
4 Western Uttar Pradesh	297.3	1.2 (0.4)	12.7 (4.3)	46.2 (15.5)	8.8 (3.0)	41.2 (13.8)	176.0 (59.2)	10.4 (3.5)	0.8 (.3)
5 Punjab-PEPSU	516.0	12.8 (2.5)	9.9 (1.9)	100.3 (19.5)	79.6 (15.4)	160.1 (31.0)	147.2 (28.5)	3.7 (.7)	2.3 (.5)
6 Rajasthan	495.8	1.3 (0.3)	2.9 (0.6)	45.3 (9.1)	2.9 (0.6)	0.5 (.1)	431.5 (87.1)	1.2 (.2)	10.1 (2.0)
7 Central India	225.5	37.0 (16.4)	4.8 (2.1)	11.4 (5.1)	11.6 (5.2)	10.6 (4.7)	145.8 (64.7)	0.5 (.2)	3.7 (1.6)
8 Orissa and East Madhya Pradesh	101.4	4.8 (4.7)	4.2 (4.1)	10.4 (10.3)	1.1 (1.1)	11.8 (11.6)	67.5 (66.6)	1.5 (1.5)	0.1 (.1)
9 Western Cotton region	244.5	26.7 (10.9)	24.1 (9.9)	49.5 (20.2)	17.2 (7.0)	5.1 (2.1)	89.5 (36.6)	27.6 (11.3)	4.8 (2.0)
10 North Deccan	352.7	13.9 (3.9)	24.4 (6.9)	34.5 (9.8)	2.0 (0.6)	120.4 (34.1)	128.7 (36.5)	27.9 (7.9)	0.9 (.3)
11 South Deccan	434.5	4.3 (1.0)	16.7 (3.8)	17.6 (4.0)	2.9 (0.7)	231.2 (53.2)	153.3 (35.3)	5.6 (1.3)	3.0 (.7)
12 East Coast	420.2	12.3 (2.9)	13.6 (3.2)	19.1 (4.5)	1.9 (0.5)	234.4 (55.8)	98.8 (23.5)	39.1 (9.3)	1.1 (.3)
13. West Coast	220.1	1.0 (0.5)	8.9 (4.0)	23.0 (10.4)	6.5 (3.0)	32.3 (14.7)	60.1 (27.3)	75.7 (35.7)	9.6 (4.4)

¹ Separate data on debt owed to co-operatives and commercial banks are not available

CHAPTER 19

GOVERNMENT FINANCE

19 1 STRUCTURE AND ADMINISTRATION OF GOVERNMENT FINANCE

19 1 1 Government assistance to agriculturists in the form of loans called *taccavi* in times of flood famine and such emergencies has been traditional in India. The British continued the practice of granting such loans under various regulations and later under a number of Taccavi Acts. Subsequent to the recommendations of the Famine Commission of 1880 loan operations were systematized with the passing of the Land Improvement Loans Act 1883 and the Agriculturists Loans Act 1884. Both these Acts were of an enabling character and vested in Provincial Governments powers to frame rules governing the sanctioning and disbursement of loans. The rules framed under these Acts are in force in all Part A States and several Part B and Part C States. In some of the Part B States such as Hyderabad Mysore and Madhya Bharat loans are advanced under separate Acts which are however similar to these two enabling Acts. In Travancore Cochin during the period of the Survey in the areas in the former Travancore State the Travancore Credit Bank which was organized under the Travancore Credit Bank Regulation (1938) administered the loans and in the areas in Cochin Government finance was advanced under the Cochin Agricultural Improvement Loans Act 1903 (M E).

19 1 2 In most States until the Grow More Food campaign financial assistance from Government was generally limited to the purposes specifically stipulated in the Acts. Some States found it necessary even prior to the Grow More Food campaign to make special provision for advance of loans for particular purposes or financing particular schemes. This is exemplified by the Bihar and Orissa Natural Calamities Loans Act 1931 and the Madras Land Improvement and Agriculturists Loans (Pumping Installations and Agricultural Machinery or Plant) Rules 1933. In Bombay an Act called the Bombay Land Improvement Schemes Act 1942 was passed *specifically for facilitating finance of soil conservation and other schemes*.

19 1 3 As a result of the growing seriousness of the food problem in India during the War the Government of India launched the Grow More Food campaign in the year 1943. The campaign was continued in the post war period. An important feature of this campaign was the provision of finance for certain specific purposes such as land improvement and purchase of seed and manure.

19 1 4 An important aspect of Government finance in recent years is that connected with the resettlement and rehabilitation of displaced persons from

Pakistan Large amounts, especially in the Punjab and West Bengal, have been advanced under schemes for the rehabilitation of displaced persons

Land Improvement Loans Act of 1883 and Agriculturists' Loans Act of 1884

19 1 5 The rules governing the issue of loans under the two Acts are framed by individual States and vary to some extent from State to State. Generally, the variations are minor, and for the purpose of bringing out the broad features of the system, it would suffice if various aspects of the rules formulated by any one State are discussed. The following discussion is based on the rules framed by the West Bengal Government.

19 1 6 Loans under the Land Improvement Loans Act, 1883, can be given for effecting any improvement in land, 'improvement' being defined as any work which adds to the letting value of land and includes the following:

- (i) the construction of wells, tanks and other works for the storage, supply or distribution of water for the purposes of agriculture, or for the use of men and cattle employed in agriculture,
- (ii) the preparation of land for irrigation,
- (iii) the drainage, reclamation from rivers or other waters, or protection from floods or from erosion or other damage by water, of land used for agricultural purposes or waste land which is cultivable,
- (iv) the reclamation, clearance, enclosure or permanent improvement of land for agricultural purposes,
- (v) the renewal or reconstruction of any of the foregoing works, or alterations therein or additions thereto, and
- (vi) such other work as Government may, from time to time declare to be improvements for the purpose of the Act.

The Agriculturists' Loans Act enables Government to give loans for relief of distress, purchase of seed or cattle or any other purpose not specified in the Land Improvement Loans Act but connected with agricultural objects.

19 1 7 Under the Land Improvement Loans Act, the Collector is competent to sanction loans, but for loans exceeding Rs 2 000 the previous sanction of the Commissioner is required and for those exceeding Rs 5,000 the previous sanction of Government is necessary. In respect of the Agriculturists' Loans Act, the Sub-divisional Officer can grant loans up to Rs 250 while the Collector can grant loans up to Rs 500. Loans exceeding Rs 500 require the sanction of the Commissioner and those exceeding Rs 3,000 require the sanction of Government. The rules provide that 'in the case of short term loans the average loan per head should not exceed Rs 15 and the maximum should not exceed Rs 25 in any individual case'.

19 1 8 On receipt of an application for loan under any of the two Acts, the Collector or Subdivisional Officer first ensures that the application has been made or recorded in the prescribed form. If the grant of loan appears *prima facie* to be

desirable the Collector or Subdivisional Officer makes an enquiry or causes an enquiry to be made by an officer not below the rank of *lanungo* or by a reliable non official agent for the purpose of ascertaining several particulars such as the area of land owned or occupied by the applicant status of the applicant that is whether proprietor tenure holder etc nature and value of immovable property offered as security the pre existing encumbrances on the property *names status and means* of sureties suitable date for the repayment of first instalment with reference to the circumstances under which the loan is applied for proposed instalments and period of repayment and the date on which the loan should be received by the applicant In the case of a loan under the Land Improvement Loans Act 1883 the estimated utility and value of the work proposed to be undertaken probable cost of the work and the probable date on which the work will begin to yield profit are also required to be reported by the official conducting the enquiry Also in this case particular care is taken to ascertain what encumbrances there are on the land to be improved and in cases in which doubts arise a notice is issued by the Collector or Subdivisional Officer calling upon any person objecting to the loan to appear before him at a time or place to be fixed in the notice and to submit his objections Such notices are published by being fixed in a prominent place in the village in which the land to be improved is situated After considering such evidences as the objecting parties may produce the Collector or Subdivisional Officer makes an order in writing either admitting the objection or overruling it

19 1 9 After the completion of the enquiry and disposal of the objections if any the Subdivisional Officer sends the application to the Collector with his opinion as to whether the loan is to be sanctioned or not In considering an application for a loan the Collector is to decide (1) whether the need for the loan is established (2) whether the security offered is sufficient (3) what amount should be advanced (4) the number of instalments and (5) what period is to be allowed before repayment commences The rules require the Collector to satisfy himself that the advance made to the cultivator is sufficient to cover so much of the total outlay required for the construction of the work as the borrower is unable to provide out of his own resources

19 1 10 The types of security demanded under the Land Improvement Loans Act are as follows

(1) Where the amount of the loan does not exceed three fourths of the value of the applicant's transferable interest in the land after the completion of the improvement to be effected no collateral security is required Where this condition is not satisfied further security consisting of transferable interests in other lands belonging to the applicant or to other persons willing to become his sureties or of personal security is demanded Lands which are not transferable without the landlord's consent are not ordinarily to be accepted as security If the consent in writing of all the landlords in a specified form has been previously obtained to the sale of the land in case of default there will be no objection to accepting such lands as security

(2) Where a body of five or more co-villagers bind themselves jointly and severally (joint bond) for the repayment of the loan, their personal security is generally deemed to be sufficient provided the loan does not exceed five times the annual rental of the land held by member of the group. For purpose of joint bond security there is a prescribed form which is to be filled in. The form requires the applicants to agree to certain terms and conditions including those mentioned below

(i) All and every one of the applicants and the heirs and representatives are jointly and severally bound to Government for the repayment of the whole amount payable in respect thereof

(ii) In the case of default in repayment of the said loan or any portion thereof Government has the right and power to realize the whole and every part of the money payable from the person and property whether movable or immovable and whether mentioned in the agreement or not of all and every one of the applicants and of all and each of their heirs and representatives

19 1 11 In the case of loans given under the Agriculturists Loans Act when an applicant possesses a transferable interest in immovable property of value sufficient to secure the whole amount of the loan, he may ordinarily be required to mortgage such interest or a sufficient portion thereof to Government as security. But the officer granting the loan may require or accept any other good security. Where an applicant does not possess transferable interest in immovable property sufficient for the purpose of security loan may be given against guarantee of a third party who possesses transferable interest in immovable property of value sufficient to secure the whole amount. As in the case of loans under the Land Improvement Loans Act 1883 lands which are not transferable without the landlords' consent are not ordinarily accepted as security. If the consent in writing in the prescribed form, of all the landlords is obtained to the sale of land in case of default there will be no objection in accepting such lands as security. When the applicants are a body of five or more co-villagers who bind themselves jointly and severally to Government for the payment of the amount their personal security can be accepted provided they agree to certain terms and conditions which are the same as in the case of Land Improvement Loans Act

19 1 12 On completion of the required documents and other formalities under the Land Improvement Loans Act 1883 subject to a limit of Rs 500 for a single loan or instalment loans may be disbursed in the village by the officer granting the loans or by an officer not below the rank of *kanungo* or by a reliable non-official agent. In other cases payments are to be made before a gazetted officer at the district or subdivisional treasury on presentation of the payment order by the applicant or his authorized agent. Unless otherwise ordered by the Collector loans are ordinarily to be given in three instalments viz. two-fifths before the work has been commenced, two-fifths when it is approximately half finished and one-fifth when it has been passed as completed after due inspection. Ordinarily all loans under the Agriculturists Loans Act are to be disbursed in the village by any of the previously mentioned

authorities and in other cases payment is made before a gazetted officer at the district or subdivisional treasury

19 1 13 The loans under the Land Improvement Loans Act are reported to be generally made repayable in a number of instalments. The date of repayment of the last instalment of a loan is ordinarily not later than 20 years from the date of actual advance of the loan or when the loan is advanced in instalments 20 years from the date of advance of the last instalment actually taken. This is subject to the condition that the whole amount of the loan outstanding shall in all cases be repaid before the expiry of the period for which the improvement is likely to be effective. Loans under the Agriculturists Loans Act are ordinarily made repayable within one or two years but for special reasons a longer period can be given with the sanction of the Commissioner. The ordinary rate of interest on both types of loans in West Bengal was reported to be $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum.

19 1 14 The rules under the Land Improvement Loans Act require the Collector to make provision for the inspection from time to time of all works under taken under the Act. In all cases the work is if possible to be inspected within one month from the date for completion of the work specified in the agreement. If at any time the Collector is convinced that any part of the loan has been misapplied or is not being spent on the work for which it was intended the Collector may after recording in writing the grounds for his decision and subject to the control of the superior revenue authorities proceed to recover the whole amount of the loan with such interest as may have become due thereon at the rate of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum from the date on which the loan was made to the date of recovery.

19 1 15 The dates for repayment of loans under both the Acts are fixed by the Collector with due regard to the dates of harvest of the principal crops. In an area which depends mainly on the crop of one season there is ordinarily only one instalment for repayment in the year in an area which depends to a more or less equal extent on the crops of two seasons there are two instalments per year. The date of repayment of the first instalment of the loan under the Land Improvement Loans Act is ordinarily fixed for the time when profit begins to accrue but in no case is it to be later than $2\frac{1}{2}$ years from the date of the actual advance of the loan or when the loan is advanced in instalments from the date of advance of the last instalment actually taken.

19 1 16 When extensive distress due to drought floods or other calamities is imminent or is present loans for the prevention or relief of distress or for enabling the people to cultivate their lands are to be disbursed in the villages with the least possible delay. For such occasions as well as when famine or scarcity have been declared by Government special rules governing such loan operations have been framed under the Agriculturists Loans Act. These loans are granted only on the joint bond system to groups of co villagers and the amount granted to each group is ordinarily not to exceed Rs 350. The number of members in a group can ordinarily be from 8 to 20 and the groups are to be so arranged that the poor and those who are

better off are combined in the same group so as to improve the security. No written application either from the group or from its individual members is necessary and detailed enquiries need not be made as to the circumstances of the borrowers. The Collector may empower Revenue Officers not below the rank of *lanungo* and other officials and also non official agents to give loans within the area declared to be affected. The officer granting the loan determines each group then lists the name of each member of the group together with the amount to be paid to each member in a schedule which serves both as a joint bond and as a receipt for the payments made. The officer then reads out the names and personally pays out to each member of the group the whole sum due to him. In periods of prolonged distress a second loan may also be given to any one who has already received a loan.

19 1 17 It has been noted that the rules framed under the two Acts show some variations from State to State. The extent of variation in the rates of interest charged on loans advanced by Government, based on information available with us, is brought out in the following table

(Generally as in 1951)

State	RATE OF INTEREST MOST FREQUENTLY OR USUALLY CHARGED ON LOANS (PER CENT PER ANNUM)	
	Land Improvement Loans Act *	Agriculturists Loans Act *
Part A States		
Assam	6½	6½
Bihar	6½	6½
Bombay	5½	5½
Madras	4½	4½
Madhya Pradesh	7½	7½
Orissa	5½ 6½	5½ 6½
Punjab	4½	4½
Uttar Pradesh	5½	5½
West Bengal	6½	6½
Part B and C States		
Hyderabad	6½	6½
Mysore	5	5
Rajasthan	3½	3½
Saurashtra	-	2½
Seed loans	-	5½
All others	5½	5½
Bhopal	4½ and 4½	4½ and 4½
Himachal Pradesh	4	4
Tripura	6	6

* Under these or similar other Acts or schemes

19 1 18 The Agriculturists' Loans Act enables Government to give loans for purposes 'not specified in the Land Improvement Loans Act but enumerated with agricultural objects'. The State Governments have framed rules for the advance of loans for special purposes under this provision. For instance, in West Bengal, loans can be given to agriculturists to facilitate processes which are ordinarily employed by them or which are necessary to the marketing of their crops, e.g., for

the purchase of small plants for *gur* making oil pressing cotton ginning and *dhan* husking In Madras loans for the relief of indebtedness can be advanced under the Act

System of Government finance in some States where Land Improvement Loans Act, 1883, and Agriculturists' Loans Act, 1884, are not in force

19 1 19 The structure and working of Government finance in some of the Part B States where loans are advanced under Acts other than the two Central Acts are briefly reviewed below

(1) *Mysore* In Mysore loans are advanced to cultivators by Government under the Mysore Land Improvement Loans Act 1890 and Section 194 of the Mysore Land Revenue Code which are analogous to the Land Improvement Loans Act 1883 and Agriculturists Loans Act 1884 respectively The loans made under the former are known as land improvement loans while those under the Land Revenue Code are generally called *taccavi* loans The actual administrative procedure for the issue of these loans is more or less the same as in the States where the two Central Acts are in force

(2) *Rajasthan* In many of the former princely States comprising Rajasthan Government finance was undertaken more as an emergency measure to mitigate the hardships of drought and famine than as a normal source for the supply of agricultural finance After the formation of the State of Rajasthan the State Government adopted Tacquavi Rules on 6 February 1950 Loans are classified into two classes Class I and Class II according to the purpose for which they are given Under Class I loans amounts are advanced for construction and repairs of *kutchra* and *pucca* wells deepening or boring of wells and for bunding and land improvement Loans under Class II are given for purchase of seed manure bullocks fodder agricultural implements and persian wheels Loans for *kutchra* wells are ordinarily repayable within a year other Class I loans are generally repayable within 10 years and in special cases the period can be extended to 20 years In the case of Class II loans the duration varies according to purpose Loans for fodder and implements are repayable in three six monthly instalments Loans for seed are to be repaid after the harvest of the crop Loans for purchase of cattle are to be recovered within three years and in special cases in five years

(3) *Hyderabad* In Hyderabad loans to agriculturists are granted under the Hyderabad Land Improvement Loans Act 1950 and the Hyderabad Agriculturists Loans Act 1950 which are analogous to the Land Improvement Loans Act 1883 and the Agriculturists Loans Act 1884 respectively

(4) *Travancore Cochin* In Travancore Cochin at the time of the Survey, the system of Government finance followed in the districts included under the two former States of Travancore and Cochin was not the same In the erstwhile Travancore State the Travancore Credit Bank was established under the Travancore Credit Bank Regulation in 1938 to take over among other things the affairs and business of the former Travancore State Land Mortgage Bank and to lend money

on the first mortgage of immovable property in Travancore for various agricultural purposes including (i) liquidation of bona fide debts charged on immovable property, (ii) purchase of and taking on lease of any agricultural or other land, (iii) development and improvement of land including the incurring of capital expenditure for the preparation of the produce for the market, (iv) carrying on or development of the business of agriculture or industry, (v) liquidation of debts already incurred by agriculturists within the meaning of the Travancore Agriculturists' Relief Regulation or incurred for any of the above purposes and (vi) any purpose, 'incidental accessory, auxiliary or ancillary' to any of the above purposes. The major part of the shares of the Bank is held by the Government of Travancore-Cochin. Officers of the Revenue Department assist the Bank in assessing the value and income of the securities and also in the scrutiny of the title deeds. The Bank obtains a report on valuation and income of the securities also from a valuator appointed by the Bank. The Board of Directors of the Bank ordinarily sanction a sum not exceeding 50 per cent of the value of the securities. The recovery of the outstandings is effected through the Revenue Department under the Revenue Recovery Act by summary process. In the erstwhile Cochin State (Cochin area of the Travancore-Cochin State), the system of advancing loans, both short-term and long term, for agricultural purposes continued to be under the provisions of the Cochin Agricultural Improvement Loans Act, 1903 (M.E.) Under the Act, short term loans which are repayable within three years are issued for the relief of distress and long term loans repayable within ten years are advanced for agricultural improvement.

Some special regulations which preceded the Grow More Food campaign

19 1 20 The provisions for granting loans to agriculturists, which were in force in addition to the Agriculturists' Loans Act, 1884, and the Land Improvement Loans Act, 1883, which deserve special mention are (1) the Bihar and Orissa Natural Calamities Loans Act, 1934, (2) the Madras Land Improvement and Agriculturists' Loans (Pumping Installations and Agricultural Machinery or Plant) Rules, 1933, and (3) the Bombay Land Improvement Schemes Act, 1942.

19 1 21 *The Bihar and Orissa Natural Calamities Loans Act, 1934* This act enabled the Government to grant loans to owners of buildings which were damaged or destroyed by earthquakes or other natural calamities for purposes of construction or repairs of buildings.

19 1 22 *The Madras Land Improvement and Agriculturists' Loans (Pumping Installations and Agricultural Machinery or Plant) Rules, 1933.* Under these Rules loans can be granted to any owner or occupier of arable land for erecting or completing a pumping installation or for the purchase of agricultural machinery or plant and for carrying out any improvement to his land in connexion with such installation or the use of such machinery or plant. The powers for making these loans rest in the Revenue Officers. The District Agricultural Officers can also grant loans not exceeding Rs 100 for the purchase of agricultural machinery or plant. In the case of loans for or in connexion with the erection of pumping installations, the technical

advice of the Director of Industries and Commerce is to be sought before their sanction. In certain instances the Public Works Department is also to be consulted prior to the sanction of loans. Where a loan is sanctioned for the purchase and erection of any plant, the Director of Agriculture shall purchase the plant and erect it or cause it to be erected.

19 1 23 *The Bombay Land Improvement Schemes Act 1942* For many years, bunding which is a principal measure of soil conservation was carried out in Bombay State under the supervision of the Agricultural Department which offered technical assistance to cultivators. In 1910, it was decided to undertake bunding operations on a large scale. The Bombay Land Improvement Schemes Act was accordingly passed in 1912. The famine of 1912 in the Bijapur district accelerated the pace of work. The 1912 Act was amended in 1918. The Act provides for the making and execution of schemes relating to construction of tanks, embankments and other works leading to improved water supply, schemes relating to preservation of soil and prevention of soil erosion, schemes of dry farming and of reclamation of water logged lands, etc. Under the (amended) Act, for each district, a Board is constituted consisting of the District Collector, the District Agricultural Officer, the Divisional Soil Conservation Officer and not more than two non official members. This Board prepares schemes for land improvement and is empowered to execute them. A draft scheme for a particular area is prepared and published for information. An enquiry officer then considers any objections from interested parties. The Board finally sanctions the scheme with or without modifications. Every owner of land included in the scheme is required to pay the prescribed costs of improvement works carried out by Government on his lands. Persons whose lands are not directly included in the scheme but are likely to be benefited by such works, are also liable to pay prescribed contributions to Government if the work has been carried out by the Board and to the landowner if he has completed the same. The schemes are partly subsidized, and costs charged to the landowners are recovered over a period.

The Grow More Food campaign

19 1 24 In view of the growing seriousness of the food problem, a conference of the representatives of the Provinces and Indian States was called by the Government of India in April 1942. The recommendations for increasing food production within the country which were made by this conference formed the basis of what has come to be known as the Grow More Food campaign. Almost up to 1917, the main lines of action of the movement were (1) switch over from cash crops, mainly short staple cotton, to food crops, (2) intensive cultivation through irrigation, use of better seeds and manures and better farming practices and (3) extensive cultivation by bringing under plough current fallows, cultivable waste lands, etc. For these schemes, the Centre was giving loans and grants to State Governments. In 1916 it was decided to continue the Grow More Food campaign on a planned basis for another five years. In June 1950, in view of the acute shortage of cotton and jute, a policy of simultaneously increasing production of cotton and jute along with foodgrains was announced. Subsequently, several additions like the programme for

the reclamation of land by the Central Tractor Organization, were made. In 1949-50 the financial assistance for Grow More Food schemes was extended to all Part B States also

19.1.25 Financial assistance from Government of India to State Governments for approved schemes was given in the form of loans and grants. Loans were given for permanent schemes of a remunerative nature like minor irrigation and land improvement works. Subsidies were given for small private minor irrigation and land improvement schemes which were not remunerative and for seeds, manure and staff. Loans were generally medium-term, repayable during a period of five to ten years. Short-term loans for one year for purchase of seeds and fertilizers were also given to State Governments as a temporary 'ways and means' advance which had to be repaid within the financial year. In respect of permanent schemes which were not remunerative, the Government of India normally gave loans for financing the economic portion of the expenditure and grants for sharing the uneconomic portion. The grant or subsidy was shared between Central Government and State Governments. Government of India's share was normally 50 per cent in case of Part A and Part B States except Assam and Orissa and 65½ per cent in case of Assam and Orissa. In regard to Part C States except Coorg the whole subsidy was borne by Central Government, in case of Coorg, Central Government financed 75 per cent of the subsidy

19.1.26 The total expenditure sanctioned by Central Government for the Grow More Food schemes from 1943 onwards up to 1950-1 came to about Rs 67.5 crores (including a share of the food procurement bonus); the details are as follows:

(In crores of rupees)

Expenditure under Grow More Food campaign			
Grants.....	21.72		
Loans.....	25.58		
Sanctioned from food bonus.....	11.80	62.10	
Expenditure under Grow More Food campaign.....	62.10		
.....	0.20		
.....	0.76		
		5.44	
		67.54	

19.1.27 We do not have data regarding the total amounts advanced by State Governments under the Grow More Food campaign. The data collected by the field staff in the selected districts in this regard do not seem to be complete. Loans under the Grow More Food campaign were reported only in about half the number of districts. It is not clear whether in the other districts loans under the Grow More Food campaign were not advanced or whether details could not be obtained regarding the loans advanced under the campaign, as distinct from those made under the Agriculturists' Loans Act and the Land Improvement Loans Act or other similar Acts.

19.1.28 As the nature and scope of various schemes implemented under the Grow More Food campaign vary considerably in different parts of the country, we

propose to describe only a few illustrative practices obtaining in some of the more important States. The main types of schemes included in the Grow More Food programme are (1) supply and distribution of seeds manures and fertilizers (2) minor irrigation (3) land improvement including reclamation and (4) miscellaneous schemes such as plant protection etc.

19 1 29 *SUPPLY SCHEMES* The supply of manures fertilizers seeds implements etc. forms an essential feature of the campaign. The programme has four aspects viz., (1) increasing the availability (2) arranging for distribution (3) providing short term loans and (4) granting of subsidies for popularizing the use of new strains of seeds or new fertilizers.

19 1 30 *Seeds* The distribution of improved seeds manure and implements was generally arranged through the Agricultural Department, though the prevailing practice varied from State to State. In Madhya Pradesh it is reported that improved paddy seed was distributed to the cultivators at a subsidized rate and the value of material was treated as *taccavi* loan under the Agriculturists Loans Act, in many cases loans were given on the joint liability of groups of cultivators. The loan if repaid in one instalment immediately after harvest was treated as interest free. Otherwise interest was charged at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum against $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent charged on the loans under the Agriculturists Loans Act. In Madras interest free seed loans were given by the Agricultural Department through the District Agricultural Officers. These loans were made under the Agriculturists Loans Act the maximum amount which could be advanced under the scheme was Rs 120 per borrower. The loans which were often in kind did not exceed in value fifteen times the land revenue paid by the borrower. There was no detailed enquiry into the repaying capacity beyond obtaining a certificate in this regard from the village officers. Repayments were fixed in two equal annual instalments to be paid along with land revenue.

19 1 31 *Manures fertilizers and implements* In Madhya Pradesh oilcake was distributed for manuring paddy jowar and wheat. The value of manure was treated as a loan carrying a concessional rate of interest repayable immediately after harvest. Distribution of fertilizers at a subsidized price was also undertaken by the Government. The State Government advanced loans to cultivators for purchase of tractors and other ploughing equipment *rahats* (persian wheels) power pumping plants etc. The size of loan varied with the purpose. For instance for purchase of *rahats* the amount generally sanctioned was less than Rs 1 000 while for purchase of tractor and other ploughing equipment up to 50 per cent of the estimated cost of the equipment was advanced. The concessional rate of interest charged varied from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum. In Madras loans up to Rs 100 in each case for the purchase of implements at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum repayable in two years and up to Rs 200 in each case for purchase of manures for cotton repayable at the end of the crop season were made by the Agricultural Department. The correctness of the particulars in the applications for loans was verified by field

ministries of the Agricultural Department The loans were sanctioned by the District Agricultural Officer and disbursed by the Agricultural Demonstrator, after obtaining the personal security bond

19 1 32 IRRIGATION SCHEMES Activities under the Grow More Food campaign with regard to irrigation were mostly restricted to development of minor irrigation sources. Minor irrigation schemes included works which could be completed within a short period (one to three years) and which did not require large expenditure. No rigid monetary ceilings have, however, been fixed for differentiating between major and minor irrigation schemes. Minor irrigation schemes were of two types, viz., private and public. 'Private' schemes were those which benefited individuals or a group and were owned by them. These included wells, tanks, water lifting appliances, etc. 'Public' schemes were executed by State Governments for the benefit of a village or a group of villages. These consisted of construction of and repairs to channels, embankments, tube wells, public tanks, etc. We are directly concerned only with the financing of private minor irrigation schemes. The particular types of minor irrigation schemes taken up by various State Governments varied according to the local circumstances.

19 1 33 Well-digging In Bombay, a scheme was initiated in 1944 for advancing *taccau* loans for constructing new wells or repairing old wells meant for irrigation, to the full extent of the estimated cost of construction or repair, at a concessional rate of interest of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum. Till 1950 a subsidy equivalent to 25 per cent of the cost of construction or repair, subject to a maximum of Rs 500 in the case of a new well and Rs 250 for the repair of an old well, was being granted.

19 1 34 Lift irrigation In Bombay lift irrigation projects were undertaken by Government in 1947. In 1949, the Government decided not to undertake any more projects on its own account, but to subsidize the capital cost of the lift irrigation schemes which might be implemented by co-operative lift irrigation societies. These societies were also given other assistance by Government under this scheme. Under the scheme, Government were (1) to advance a loan of 50 per cent of the cost of construction and installation of pumping plants at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent interest, the amount of the loan being repayable in 15 annual instalments, (2) to give the balance of 50 per cent of the capital cost as subsidy, subject to a maximum of Rs 150 per acre irrigated, and (3) to extend a subsidy of Rs 900 for the first year and Rs 450 for each of the second and third years towards the cost of employing the services of a secretary-cum-engine driver for each society. The Co-operative Department gave priority for organizing co-operative lift irrigation societies and the Public Works Department and the Agricultural Engineer to Government gave technical advice on the construction of works and installation of pumping machinery, respectively. The Government also gave assistance in purchasing engines, cement, iron and steel. Arrangements for training of drivers were made by the Agricultural Engineer to Government.

19 I 35 *LAND IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES* Land improvement schemes were mainly of three types viz (1) reclamation of waste lands including *kans* and jungle lands drainage of marshy and water logged areas development of *khar* and *usar* lands etc (2) mechanical cultivation and (3) contour bunding for soil conservation and preservation of moisture

19 I 36 *Reclamation of land* Reclamation of *kans* infested and jungle lands by the Central Tractor Organization was the most important scheme under this head Other schemes of land improvement were drainage of marshy lands flushing of saline lands etc Marshy lands occur mostly in Assam Orissa West Bengal Bihar and to a certain extent in the coastal areas of Madras The improvement of these lands was effected by digging channels for draining surplus water Reclamation of *khar* and *usar* lands provides an example of schemes for reducing salinity

19 I 37 Although loans were given under the Land Improvement Loans Act for reclamation and other land improvements the activity in these directions was not considerable and to step up the pace of work several State Governments found it necessary to pass special Acts The Bombay Government passed the Bombay Khar Lands Act 1918 for the protection and improvement of *khar* lands and the reclamation of tidal lands through the Khar Development Board There were also other Acts like the Bihar Waste Lands (Reclamation Cultivation and Improvement) Act 1916 the East Punjab Reclamation of Land Act 1949 the Central Provinces Reclamation of Lands (Liquidation of Kans) Act 1918 etc These Acts empower Government to take possession of the land reclaim the land or carry out necessary improvements and hand over the possession of the land to the owner within a stipulated period The Bombay Act provides that the cost of the scheme shall be met by contribution of Government the landlord and the tenant the landlord and the tenant being granted loans if necessary for meeting their contribution The other Acts enable the respective State Governments to incur the entire expenditure and recover it from the persons benefiting either in a lump sum or in instalments The Bihar Waste Lands (Reclamation Cultivation and Improvement) Act which is a very comprehensive measure provides for a maximum period of possession of the land by Government for ten years According to the Act the expenditure incurred by Government in reclaiming the land and interest at a rate not exceeding 3 per cent per annum are to be recovered from the beneficiaries in not more than 10 instalments

19 I 38 *Mechanical cultivation* In addition to the Central Tractor Organization of the Government of India several State Governments have set up State Tractor Organizations for undertaking reclamation of jungle lands and lands which are out of cultivation The Central Tractor Organization recovers the costs of operation from State Governments which in turn recover these amounts from the beneficiaries The Organization works on a 'no profit no loss' basis The rates charged by the State Tractor Organizations vary from State to State and according to the operations The State Tractor Organizations aim to work on a self financing basis In connexion with the work of mechanical cultivation at least two States

have found it necessary to pass special Acts for purposes of recovery of cultivation charges. The East Punjab Tractor Cultivation (Recovery of Charges) Act, 1919, requires the cultivator to deposit ordinarily the full estimated cost of tractor cultivation along with the application for the sanction of the scheme, while the Madhya Bharat Tractor Cultivation (Recovery of Charges) Act, 1950, requires the cultivator to deposit 10 per cent of the full tractor cultivation charges immediately after acceptance of the application, the balance is recovered from him after the completion of the project. According to both the Acts the sum due from a cultivator is recoverable as arrears of land revenue. The Central Tractor Organization is responsible only for the reclamation and the arrangements for the follow up cultivation are made by the State Government or by the beneficiaries. To ensure follow up cultivation, some of the State Governments assist the beneficiaries by way of *taccari* loans etc.

19 1 39 *Soil conservation* Loans for soil conservation, terracing, bunding, etc., are made under the Land Improvement Loans Act. But several States have passed special Acts to accelerate the pace of work in these directions. These Acts are of interest from the point of view of agricultural credit, the most important of these is the Bombay Land Improvement Schemes Act, 1912, the details of which have already been set out. Under the Act, the Government undertook bunding on a large scale during the famine year of 1942, in the dry farming areas of Bijapur. The scheme was later extended to Dharwar, Belgaum, Sholapur, Poona, Ahmednagar and Satara districts. The unusually heavy monsoon of 1946 caused serious damage to the bunds in the black soil areas and this led to an outcry against the scheme. The Act was amended in 1948. Under the Act, as amended in 1948, the schemes are to be made public for eliciting public opinion and are to be executed only after the objections raised by the landholders have been met. If, from among landholders affected by any scheme, the number of landholders who oppose the scheme is not less than 33 per cent of the total number of landholders other than Government, or if owners other than Government owning not less than 33 per cent of the aggregate area raise objections, the scheme has to be considered and sanctioned by the Government. Although initiated as early as 1942, the bunding scheme was later made part of the Grow More Food campaign.

19 1 40 *Big Growers' Loan* Under the Grow More Food campaign, the West Bengal Government gave loans to farmers owning large holdings under the scheme of Big Growers' Loan. Loans of size more than Rs 5,000 only were considered under the scheme. The loans were sanctioned by the Director of Agriculture. The scrutiny of the application and the required enquiry on the securities etc., were conducted by the Agricultural Department. Every loan was repayable in ten annual instalments.

Rehabilitation of displaced persons

19 1 41 According to the data available with us, rehabilitation finance was of sizable magnitude only in the Punjab, West Bengal, Assam and PEPSU, though this type of finance was also given in other States like Uttar Pradesh. The procedure for giving loans varied from State to State. In Assam, Uttar Pradesh and the

Punjab special Acts viz the Assam Displaced Persons (Rehabilitation Loans) Act 1951 the United Provinces Refugees Rehabilitation (Loans) Act 1948 and the East Punjab Refugees Rehabilitation (Loans and Grants) Act 1948 respectively governed the issue of loans and grants to displaced persons. Loans and grants to displaced persons in PEPSU were given according to the detailed procedure laid down in the Standing Order No 32 of the Financial Commissioner (Punjab) and the PEPSU Refugees Rehabilitation (Loans and Grants) Ordinance No XI of 2005 (*Samrat*). Such loans were offered in West Bengal under several orders, notifications and rules specially promulgated or framed by the State Government. The administrative procedures in connexion with the issue of loans under the rehabilitation schemes in two of the States viz West Bengal and PEPSU are discussed below.

19 1 42 **WEST BENGAL** Loans and subsidies to displaced persons from Pakistan are granted under several Government schemes, orders and notifications and not under any statute. There are five major schemes under which loans are extended in addition to the gratuitous relief which is granted in deserving cases. They are (1) land purchase loans (2) house building loans (3) agricultural loans (4) small traders loans and (5) maintenance loans for agriculturists, traders and professional men, varying from 1 month to 15 months. Loans for professional men e.g. lawyers and medical men and business loans up to Rs 5 000 are also advanced to displaced persons.

(i) *Land purchase loans* A bona fide displaced person can apply for the loan to the District or Subdivisional Relief Officer. The loan is sanctioned after due enquiry by any of the three following officers: Subdivisional Officer, District Rehabilitation Officer or Subdivisional Relief and Rehabilitation Officer. The loan is interest free in the first year but bears 3 per cent interest for the subsequent four years within which period the loan must be repaid. The loan is advanced against an unregistered deed and the borrower has to undertake to mortgage the land when purchased to Government.

(ii) *House building loans* After a displaced person has actually purchased land, he can apply to the concerned authorities for a loan for construction of houses. The maximum loan ordinarily sanctioned is Rs 500 in rural areas and Rs 1 250 to Rs 5 000 in urban areas. The loan is disbursed in two instalments in rural areas. The disbursement of subsequent instalments depends on the result of enquiry into the actual utilization of previous instalments.

(iii) *Agricultural loans* These loans are usually sanctioned in rural areas to displaced persons for purchasing agricultural land, reclamation of land, irrigation, purchase of seed and manure, implements and cattle. Ordinarily a maximum amount of Rs 900 is admissible for purchase of agricultural land (when acquired land is not available), Rs 600 for agricultural implements etc. and Rs 50 per acre for reclamation. The loan is sanctioned and disbursed by any one of the three officers referred to above. The loan is interest free for the first two years but carries an interest of 3 per cent for the subsequent eight years. Land or implements purchased have to be pledged to Government.

(iv) *Small traders loans* Loans up to Rs 750 in urban areas and Rs 500 in the rural areas are sanctioned under this scheme.

19 1 43 *PEPSU* Distribution and recovery of *taccat* loans to displaced persons settled in the rural area of PEPSU are governed by the detailed procedure laid down in the Punjab Financial Commissioner's Standing Order No 32 and the PEPSU Refugees Rehabilitation (Loans and Grants) Ordinance. So far as the budgetary provisions are concerned the Director of Rehabilitation (Rural) informs the Deputy Commissioners and Assistant Commissioners (Rehabilitation) the amounts placed at their disposal for advance of loans under each head. They, in turn, allocate the sums assigned to them to the tahsils in their jurisdiction, according to their requirements worked out in proportion to the number of families settled in a particular tahsil, with due consideration for the Muslim evacuee areas allotted to them. The Assistant Commissioners (Rehabilitation) do the distribution work under the overall supervision of the Deputy Commissioners. The purposes for which loans are given include purchase of seed, bullocks, bullock carts and agricultural implements, repairs of wells, repairs of damaged evacuee houses and settlement of displaced village artisans, mazdoors, etc. The amount of the loan varies with the purpose and is interest free for the first year, but interest is charged at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent for the subsequent years. Borrowers who have previously received *taccat* loans are not eligible for grant of fresh loans for the purposes for which they were advanced. But those who received an amount of *taccat* less than the limit prescribed are allowed to get *taccat* equal to the difference between that already obtained and the prescribed limit. The property of the allottee, including the land and house allotted is generally hypothecated till the loan is repaid. Loans are also advanced to groups of persons who bind themselves jointly and severally for repayment. Amount of loans for different purposes are determined after fully examining the actual requirements of the borrowers. But in no case is a loan to exceed the stipulated limits prescribed for each category of loan. Thus seed *taccat* is distributed at the rate of Rs 25 per allottee owning six acres of land and Rs 50 per allottee owning more than six acres of land. The seed loan is repayable at the ensuing harvest. In the case of loans for purchase of bullocks only cultivators who have been allotted more than two acres of land are entitled to borrow. Similarly, rules for various categories of loans like purchase of pumping sets, erection of tube wells, purchase of tractors, repairs and construction of houses, etc., have also been framed.

Administrative arrangements

19 1 44 We shall now briefly review the administrative arrangements in relation to Government finance on the basis of the information collected by the field staff and the replies sent by respondents to the General Questionnaire. The procedure for scrutiny and sanction of applications by governmental agencies varies not only from State to State but in some cases from scheme to scheme also. The variations have been brought out in the descriptions of different schemes given above.

19 1 45 In many States, different kinds of loans are sanctioned by different departments of Government. From the replies of knowledgeable persons, these arrangements have caused overlapping and consequent duplication and financial waste to some extent. In particular, the reply received from the Secretary to the

Government of a Part A State is illustrative of the extent to which there is overlapping in some schemes and how loans for almost similar purposes are being given by different departments. The official says

The purposes for which loans are commonly given under this Act [Land Improvement Loans Act 1883] are the construction of embankments the construction or boring of masonry or semi masonry wells the sinking of tubewells and the installation of some form of power plant for the lifting of water there from together with the construction of distributing channels. The loans under Act XII of 1881 are intended for (1) improvements and (2) relief of distress. The improvements under this Act need not necessarily be of a durable character. In normal circumstances the loan under the Act is usually given for improved seeds improved cattle fertilizers and agricultural implements or machinery and to tide over a special period of crisis caused by an agricultural calamity. He further states

Apart from the purposes mentioned above *taccavi* is granted for certain schemes also. These are

- (1) for payment of hire charges of tractors
- (2) for the purchase of tractors
- (3) for the purchase of bullocks and agricultural implements
- (4) for the reclamation of *usar* and forests
- (5) interest free *taccavi* in the shape of material that is iron cement and coal etc. for the construction of masonry wells
- (6) for boring wells or installation of persian wheels (if the work is done through Government Department half the cost is given as interest free *taccavi*)
- (7) for the construction of tubewells and installation of pumping plants (if done through Government Department one third of the cost is given as interest free *taccavi*) [by one Department]
- (8) for the purchase of cows herd bulls and requisite machinery and other material for the establishment of dairy [by another Department]
- (9) for the purchase of improved seeds agricultural implements manure bulls and cows is given in kind [by a third Department] and finally
- (10) for *kollus* fire pans and *wardha ghanu* [by yet another Department]

19146 In a similar context the Registrar of Co operative Societies of a Part A State states

So far as the different schemes of the Government itself are concerned there is harmony in regard to objects financial provisions and administrative arrangements in so far as they are co ordinated through the District Magistrate. But even here it is my personal experience that there is a tendency to create independent drawing and disbursing officers who do not come under the general

co-ordinating function of the District Officer but who deal directly with some special department of Government. There has been recently such multiplication of governmental activities and departments that in some cases each is acting independently of the other even with regard to almost similar schemes.

19.2 THE ROLE OF THE STATE AS A CREDIT AGENCY

19.2.1 In relation to Government finance three different type of data are available to us. In the first instance we have data obtained from all families in the selected villages through the General Schedule. Secondly we have data obtained from a sample of cultivating families in the intensive enquiry schedules. The third type of data is the information obtained from Government authorities. The information collected by us directly from the Collectors or Tahsildar offices related to the total volume of Government finance for agriculture sanctioned for the district. At the same time we instituted a study of a sample of about 100 sanctioned and 20 rejected loan applications in each district with a view to obtaining more detailed information regarding loan operations. All the three types of data are brought together and analysed in this chapter. It is however necessary at the outset to state some of the limitations of the data.

19.2.2 In the schedule in which data on Government finance were collected, provision was made for recording details relating to the number of applications received during the year, the amount applied for in these applications, the number of applications sanctioned during the year and the amount applied for and the amount sanctioned on these applications, in respect of each Act and scheme in force. Further a purpose-wise classification of the amount sanctioned was also required to be given. In several districts the information obtained was far from complete. For instance, for some districts it was not possible to obtain data regarding the volume of finance extended in the district as a whole. While in some of these districts the data on the advances under the various Acts and schemes are uniformly available for a given number of talukas, in others the coverage secured varied with the Act or scheme. The variation in the coverage in respect of the data relating to the different Acts and schemes has been ignored in the analysis of the total data. In some districts it has not been possible to obtain data relating to some particular Act or scheme. The total amount sanctioned does not therefore in all cases represent the total finance made available by Government in the district.

19.2.3 There are some districts in which although generally complete coverage was secured, information in respect of the four items viz. the number of applications received, the number of applications sanctioned, the amount applied for in the applications received and the amount applied for in the applications sanctioned, was not uniformly available for all the talukas of the district. We have presented in table 19.2 the data on the number of applications sanctioned. Not in all districts do the figures represent the total number of applications sanctioned by Government.

19.2.4 It is likely that in a number of districts data relating to loans under the Grow More Food campaign as distinct from loans under the Land Improvement

Loans Act and the Agriculturists' Loans Act, were not separately available. In the case of loans for the rehabilitation of displaced persons, the data obtained may not, in all cases relate exclusively to advances made for agricultural purposes to displaced persons settled in the rural area. Further, in some cases the data supplied to the field staff were reported to be tentative. Analysis of data relating to subsidies presents a special difficulty, as in a number of cases amounts were originally advanced as loans and converted later, partly or wholly into subsidies.

19 2 5 Direct comparison between the different types of data is subject to many limitations. These are elaborated later in another context where a direct comparison of the demand side data with the 'supply' side data is attempted. Mention may however be made regarding the difference in the periods to which the different types of data relate. The data regarding the total volume of Government finance extended in the district collected from the Government offices, relate to the year 1950-1—in some cases the agricultural year July to June and in others the financial year April to March. The sample of loans included in the detailed study regarding loan operations generally relate to the agricultural or financial year 1950-1. The General Schedule was filled in at different times and the data collected in the schedule, which have reference to the 12 months preceding the month of interview, relate to what may be called a 'moving year', in most cases the data relate to a period of one year ending in one of the four months November 1951 to February 1952. The intensive enquiry data relate to the period April 1951 to March 1952.

19 2 6 The available data on the amounts sanctioned for agricultural purposes under the different Acts and schemes in the different districts are presented in table 19 1. The total number of loan and subsidy applications sanctioned is given in table 19 2. In table 19 3, the coverage of the data relating to each Act and scheme is indicated. The total number of loans sanctioned by various Government agencies varied over a wide range, from 1 in Sirmoor to 19,008 in West Godavari. However in the large majority of districts the number of loans sanctioned was less than 5,000 and in quite a few of them, of the order of 1,000 or less. The amount sanctioned varied from Rs 5,000 in Sirmoor to about Rs 68 lakhs in West Godavari. Except in 22 districts, the total amount advanced was less than Rs 10 lakhs. The 22 districts where more than Rs 10 lakhs were advanced by Government are in Assam, Tripura, West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, the Punjab, Madhya Pradesh, Saurashtra, Bombay and Madras. Among these 22 districts, in the Assam and the Punjab districts and in Nainital district of Uttar Pradesh, the advances were largely in connexion with the rehabilitation of displaced persons. In Malda district of West Bengal also rehabilitation finance was important. In Bilaspur, Sagar and Akola districts of Madhya Pradesh and in Sorath district of Saurashtra, the advances were largely under the Grow More Food campaign. In the remaining districts, generally, finance under the Agriculturists' Loans Act was of greater importance. It will be seen later that in some of these districts loans under the Agriculturists' Loans Act were advanced for relief of distress due to natural calamities. Amounts sanctioned under the Land Improvement Loans Act were prominent in only a few districts.

TABLE 19 I—GOVERNMENT FINANCE FOR AGRICULTURAL

[Amount

State District	Total	LAND IMPROVEMENT LOANS ACT 1933		AGRICULTURAL LOANS ACT 1944	
		Amount	Percentage to total	Amount	Percentage to total
	1	2	3	4	5
Assam					
Lakhimpur	5,79,423			5,72,623	98.8
Cachar	14,98,360			9,360	6.6
Kamrup	7,07,575	5,000	0.7	7,000	10.9
Tripura					
Tripura	18,86,528 ¹			18,86,528 ¹	100.0
West Bengal					
Jalpaiguri	61,700			61,700	100.0
Malda	18,23,085	30,500	1.7	2,00,700	11.3
Burdwan	3,89,644	9,524	2.4	3,00,120	9.6
Midnapore	17,93,366	3,35,170	18.7	13,00,420	75.6
Bihar					
Bhagalpur	18,66,230	6,50,902	34.9	12,15,278	65.1
Monohar	18,68,594	49,180	2.6	18,19,414	97.4
Hazaribagh	2,56,557	69,995	35.1	1,66,562	64.9
Palamu	2,82,697	10,700	3.8	1,30,565	46.2
Uttar Pradesh²					
Muzaffarpur	1,39,243	8,000	5.7	10,108	13.8
Balhar	3,27,437	1,56,860	47.9	1,70,577	52.1
Deoria	7,11,560	2,00,100	28.5	3,03,960	42.7
Jaunpur	5,56,026	2,50,850	50.5	2,70,176	49.0
Sultanpur	2,43,614	1,29,874	53.3	43,810	18.0
Sitapur	5,61,200	2,16,200	38.5	1,00,000	33.0
Kanpur	3,25,165	93,365	28.7	2,06,800	63.6
Hamirpur	70,570	29,000	41.1	27,570	39.1
Shahjahanpur	1,08,609	—	—	37,909	30.3
Agra	3,36,552	3,03,452	90.2	33,100	9.8
Aligarh	4,61,393	2,17,636	47.2	1,06,909	23.2
Nainital	12,36,930	50,000 ³	4.0	2,23,526 ³	18.1
Meerut	5,39,670	5,10,570	94.9	27,300	5.1
Himachal Pradesh					
Simla	5,000	5,000	100.0	—	—
Punjab					
Hoshiarpur	16,64,130	78,750	4.7	57,273	5.3
Jullundur	26,95,793	39,255	1.4	2,43,300	10.2
Hissar	7,79,165	6,000	0.8	—	—
PEPSU					
Bhatinda	4,23,028	—	—	—	—
Mohinderghar	63,989	—	—	—	—
Rajasthan⁴					
Churu	6,577	—	—	6,577	100.0
Barmer	56,568	—	—	46,750	82.6
Sirohi	15,600	—	—	15,600	100.0
Jaipur	2,61,250	—	—	2,61,250	100.0
Sawai Madhopur	77,635	—	—	77,635	100.0
Chittorgarh	19,900	—	—	19,900	100.0

¹ All loans issued under the Act were for persons affected by communal riots. ² Loans granted under G.M.F. campaign include those granted during the subsidies amounting to Rs. 15.22. ³ Does not include loans granted in the Tarai and Bhabar Government. ⁴ Amount distributed as loan to 26 displaced agriculturists.

PURPOSES : AMOUNT SANCTIONED DURING 1950-1

in rupees)

State District	GRAND TOTAL CASH IN HAND		TOTAL DISBURSED PERSONS		Cash sub- sidies under G.M.I. can paign
	Amount	Percentage to total	Amount	Percentage to total	
	6	7	8	9	
Assam					
Lakhimpur			6 800	1 2	
Cachar			14 00 000	33 4	1 22 043
Namrup			6 20 617	88 1	-
Tripura					
Tripura					
West Bengal					
Jalpaiguri			-	-	-
Malda			1,86 75	87 0	-
Bordwan					
Mitnagore			1 12 760	5 7	77 779
Bihar					
Baghaur			-	-	5 13 505
Monghyr					3 55 247
Muzaffargarh					1 91 908
Lulaimou	1 41 432 ^a	50 0			-
Uttar Pradesh^a					
Muzaffarpur	1 12 045 ^a	80 5			14 150
Balla			-	-	1 93 550
Deoria	2 62 500	28 5			16 141
Jaunpur					61 410
Sultanpur	60 900	28 7	-	-	94 861
Satna	1 60 000	25 5			1 02 200 ^a
Kanpur	25 000	7 7	-	-	21 443 ^a
Hanumanpur	14 000	19 8			18 041
Shahjahanpur	75 000	63 7			11 524
Agra	-				37 934
Aligarh	40 948	19 1			71 815
Nainital	-		9 63 410	77 9	-
Mirzapur					6 12 023
Himachal Pradesh					
Birmoor	-				-
Punjab					
Hoshiarpur	-		14 98 10	90 0	-
Jalandhar	3 87 500	14 4	19 94 738	74 0	-
Huair			7 73 165	99 2	-
PEPSU					
Bhatnagar	1 17 324	27 7	3 0 700	72 3	2 56 256
Mohandragarh	6 500	16 9	57 000	39 1	73 625
Rajasthan^a					
Churu	-		-	-	-
Barnier	-		9 818 ¹⁰	17 4	-
Sirohi	-		-	-	-
Jaipur	-		-	-	00 ¹¹
Sawai Madhopur	-		-	-	-
Chittorgarh	-		-	-	505

under Takavi Loan Regulations (Act 1 of 1910 T.E.) ^aData relate to loans granted under the Waste

TABLE 19.1—GOVERNMENT FINANCE FOR AGRICULTURAL

[Amount

State District	Total	LAND IMPROVEMENT LOANS ACT 1953		AGRICULTURISTS LOANS ACT, 1954	
		Amount	Percentage to total	Amount	Percentage to total
		1	2	3	4
Madhya Bharat					
Jhabua	1,13,170	-	-	-	-
Shivpur	3,39,990	-	-	-	-
Shajapur	62,650	-	-	-	-
Bhilai	4,47,405	-	-	-	-
Bhopal					
Raisen	4,93,460	-	-	-	-
Vindhya Pradesh					
Sitna	2,02,886	-	-	-	-
Pewa	2,15,928	-	-	-	-
Orissa					
Sambalpur	66,839	7 000	10.5	9 339	59.5
Puri	19,963	-	-	19 963	100.0
Koraput	99,064	8 000	8.1	89 064	89.9
Madhya Pradesh					
Bilaspur	18 03,159	-	-	1 00,535	5.6
Durg	12 05,067	7 40 000	61.5	4 61,272	38.5
Chanda	14 53 150	3 79 0 6	26.1	5 88 899	40.5
Nagpur	11,25,767	7 10 560	63.1	3 93 654	35.0
Sagar	22,95,933	1 91 400	8.3	3 91,176	13.5
Akola	13 94,835	1 96 600	14.1	4 33 409	31.1
Saurashtra					
Sorath	19,97,271	35 934	1.8	1 89 804	9.5
Bombay					
Ahmedabad	10 64,106	7,29 801 ¹¹	68.6	3 34 305 ¹²	31.4
Broach	5,56 707	94 070	17.1	4 61,757	82.9
West Khandesh	18 29,410	7 42 858	40.6	10 86,582	59.4
Poona	18 82,221	8 50 497	45.5	10 24 674	54.4
Ratnagiri	39,620	7 375	18.6	37 245	81.4
Kolhapur	2,60,340	2 19 370	84.3	35 970	13.8
Bijapur	3,60,030	2 08 400	57.9	1,43 220	39.8
Hyderabad					
Osmanabad	3,61,811	19 600	5.4	70 572	19.5
Parbhani	2,48,091	37 930	15.3	1 05 503	47.5
Nizamabad	6,54,936	-	-	1 09 000 ¹³	16.7
Mahbubnagar	2 87,077	-	-	1 01 710 ¹⁴	35.4
Mysore					
Hassan	58,954	9 825	16.7	31 700	53.8
Bangalore	28,275	12 175	43.1	16 100	56.9
Madras					
Coimbatore	12,98,760	7 75 950	59.7	5 92 810	40.3
Cuddapah	3,36,000	40 700	12.0	2 95 560 ¹⁵	85.0
Kurnool	66,515	4 000 ¹⁶	6.1	62 465 ¹⁷	93.9
West Godavari	67,63,580	49 76 145	73.6	16 30 775	24.1
Chingleput	13,98 360	1 19 050	8.5	12 79,310	91.5
Tamanathapuram	2 53,645	65 500	25.8	1 88,145 ¹⁸	74.2
Malabar	2,06,510	27 250	13.2	1,79 260	86.8
Travancore-Cochin					
Quilon	-	-	-	-	-

¹¹ Does not include loans granted for current farm expenditure. The amount granted for the include seed and manure loans granted, 200 maunds of wheat 1 604 maunds of paddy and 2 150 Municipal Board Pewa for town compost scheme. ¹² In addition to the loans sanctioned, an

¹³ Including loans granted under the Grow More Food campaign. ¹⁴ The data relate to all loans loans was available. ¹⁵ Does not include interest free loans amounting to Rs 1,60,500 sanctioned for sub taluka. ¹⁶ Of these Rs 10 010

TABLE 192—GOVERNMENT FINANCE FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS SANCTIONED DURING 1950-1

State District	NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS SANCTIONED		State District	NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS SANCTIONED		State District	NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS SANCTIONED	
	Loans	Subsidies		Loans	Subsidies		Loans	Subsidies
	I			I			I	-
Assam			Punjab			Madhya Pradesh—Conc'd		
Lakhimpur	8 006 ¹		Ho huarpur	2 713 ¹	-	Nagpur	4 006 ¹¹	
Cachar	1 000 ¹	288 ²	Jullundur	14 881	-	Sagar	6 708	65
Kamrup	250 ¹		Hissar	3 235		Akola	11 951	1
Tripura			PEPSU			Saurashtra		
Tripura	2 633		Bhatinda	161	276	Sorath	7 088	1
West Bengal			Mohindergarh	91	82	Bombay		
Jalpaiguri	294		Rajasthan			Ahmedabad	4 006 ⁴	
Malda	2 672		Churu	4		Broach	5 233	53
Burdwan	1 139		Barmer	307 ¹	-	West Khandesh	5 473	810
Midnapore	878 ³	1 354	Sirohi	66	-	Poona	6 149	61
Bihar			Jaipur	248	2	Ratnagiri	502	10
Bhagalpur	2 9 9	645	Sawai Madhopur	85	-	Kolhapur	418	3
Monghyr	5 892		Chittorgarh	731	5	Bijapur	1 539 ¹¹	-
Hazariabagh	1,167	231	Madhya Bharat			Hyderabad		
Palamau	842		Jhabua	391	-	O manabad	223 ¹	-
Uttar Pradesh			Shivpuri	1 076	-	Farbhani	1,243	-
Muzapur	369	44	Shajapur	60	1	Nizamabad	476 ¹¹	-
Ballia	1 700	598	Bilaspur	1 010	137	Mahbubnagar	471 ¹¹	-
Deoria	8 145	378	Bhopal			Mysore		
Jaunpur	4 818 ¹	642	Patna			Hassan	361	26
Saltanpur	411	260	Vindhya Pradesh			Bangalore	103	88
Stepur	1 434	204	Satna	752	-	Madras		
Kanpur	321	164	Rewa	2 458		Coimbatore	3 532	267
Hamirpur	118	60	Orissa			Cuddapah	703	284
Shahjahanpur	1 390	130	Sambalpur	1 180		Kurnool	375	223
Agra	643	58 ¹	Puri			West Godavari	19 008	111
Aligarh	1,799	671 ¹	Koraput	1 335	-	Chingleput	5 368	671
Nainital	99 ¹	6	Madhya Pradesh			Pamanatha puram	2 197	-
Meerut	589 ¹	1 602	Bilaspur	6 689	-	Malabar	2 001	277
Himachal Pradesh			Durg	3 934 ¹	37	Travancore-Cochin		
Sirmoor	1	-	Chanda	8 165 ¹⁰	-	Quilon	-	-

**TABLE 193—COVERAGE OF THE DATA RELATING TO AMOUNTS
SANCTIONED FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES BY
GOVERNMENT**

State District	Land Improvement Loans Act 1883	Agriculturists Loans Act 1884	Grow More Food campaign	Loans to displaced persons	Cash subsidies under the Grow More Food campaign
	1	2	3	4	5
Assam					
Lakhimpur	6 talukas	6 talukas	6 talukas	District	6 talukas
Goalpara	District	District	District		District
Kamrup					
Tripura					
Tripura					
West Bengal					
Jalpaiguri					
Malda				District	
Lurdwan				District	
Medinipur					
Bihar					
Bhagalpur					
Monghyr					
Hazaribagh					
Patna					
Uttar Pradesh					
Muzaffarpur					District
Balla					
Deoria					
Jaunpur					
Sultanpur			District		
Satapur					
Kanpur					
Hamirpur					
Shahjahanpur					
Agra					
Aligarh				District	
Mathura					
Meerut					
Himachal Pradesh					
Simla			District		
Punjab					
Hoshiarpur				District	
Jullundur					
Hissar					
PEPSU					
Bhatinda					
Mohandagarh					
Rajasthan					
Churu	1 taluka	1 taluka	1 taluka	1 taluka	1 taluka
Bharmer	District	District	District		District
Sirohi					
Jaipur	10 talukas	10 talukas	10 talukas		10 talukas
Sawai Madhopur	District	District	District		District
Chittorgarh	7 talukas	7 talukas	8 talukas		8 talukas

**TABLE 19.3—COVERAGE OF THE DATA RELATING TO AMOUNTS
SANCTIONED FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES BY
GOVERNMENT—Concluded**

State District	Land Improvement Loans Act, 1953	Agricultural Loans Act, 1954	Grow More Food campaign	Loans to displaced persons	Cash sub-sides under the Grow More Food campaign
	1	2	3	4	5
Madhya Bharat					
Jhabua	District	District	District		District
Shivpur	"	"	"		"
Shajapur	"	"	"		"
Bhilsa	"	"	"		"
Bhopal					
Raisen	"	"	"		"
Vindhya Pradesh					
Satna	"	"	"		"
Rewa	"	"	"		"
Orissa					
Sambalpur	"	"	"		"
Puri	"	"	"		"
Koraput	District	"	"		"
Madhya Pradesh					
Bilaspur	"	"	"		"
Durg	"	9 talukas	"		"
Chanda	"	District	4 talukas		"
Nagpur	"	4 talukas	4 "		"
Sagar	"	District	District		"
Akola	"	"	"		"
Saurashtra					
Sorath	"	"	"		"
Bombay					
Ahmedabad	"	"	"		"
Broach	"	"	"		"
West Khandesh	"	"	"		"
Poona	"	"	"		"
Ratnagiri	"	"	"		"
Kolhapur	"	"	"		"
Bijapur	"	"	"		"
Hyderabad					
Omanabad.	4 talukas	3 talukas	4 talukas		4 talukas
Parbhani	5 "	5 "	4 "		5 "
Nizamabad	"	4 "	4 "		4 "
Mahbubnagar	"	6 "	6 "		"
Mysore					
Hassan	District	District	District		District
Banwalore	"	"	"		"
Madras					
Coimbatore	"	"	"		"
Cuddapah	"	"	"		"
Kurnool	District ¹	District ¹	"		District ¹
West Godavari	District	District	"		District
Chingleput	"	"	"		6 talukas
Ramanathapuram	5 talukas	5 talukas	5 talukas		5 "
Malabar	District	District	District		District
Travancore-Cochin					
Quilon	"	"	"		"

¹ Excluding data relating to Nandyal taluka and Banganapalle sub-taluka

In some of the selected districts of Bihar Uttar Pradesh Madhya Pradesh Bombay and Madras amounts sanctioned under the Act were relatively large

Finance for rehabilitation and relief of distress

19 2 7 We may consider in some detail information relating to particular types of Government finance Advances under schemes for the rehabilitation of displaced persons were substantial in some selected districts of West Bengal Assam, the Punjab and PLPSU The following table presents in respect of those districts the data relating to lendings by Government in connexion with rehabilitation schemes The data relating to borrowings from Government reported by cultivating families in the General Schedule are also presented in the table

State District	AMOUNT SANCTIONED BY GOVERNMENT (SUPPLY SCHEDULE SY I)			Borrowings from Government as percentage of the total borrowings of cultivating families (General Schedule)
	Coverage of data	Amount sanctioned under schemes for rehabilitation of displaced persons (Rs)	Amount sanctioned under schemes for rehabilitation of displaced persons as percentage of the total amount sanctioned by Government (excluding subsidies)	
Assam	District			
Cachar		14 00 000	93 4	8 3
Kamrup		6 25 615	85 4	6 6
Punjab				
Hoshiarpur		14 98 105	90 0	31 8
Jullundur		19 94 738	74 0	2 5
Hissar		7 73 165	99 2	0 4
Uttar Pradesh				
Nainital		9 61 410	77 9	1 5
West Bengal				
Malda		15 86 755	87 0	0 9
Midnapore		1 07 766	5 7	0 7
PEPSU				
Bhaini		3 05 700	72 3	0 4
Mahendragarh		67 000	89 1	-

19 2 8 Rehabilitation finance accounted for a substantial proportion of the total amount sanctioned by Government in all these districts In Hoshiarpur where 90 per cent of the total advances were under the schemes for the rehabilitation of displaced persons about 32 per cent of the total borrowings of cultivators was from Government In Cachar loans sanctioned under the rehabilitation schemes amounted to Rs 11 lakhs about 8 per cent of the borrowings of cultivators was from Government in the district In Malda and Jullundur the amount sanctioned under the rehabilitation schemes exceeded Rs 15 lakhs and formed more than 70 per cent of the total amount of loans sanctioned by Government however borrowings from Government as proportion of the total borrowings of cultivating families as recorded in the General Schedule was at a relatively low level in both these districts

19 2 9 In a number of districts substantial amounts under the Agriculturists Loans Act were advanced for relief of distress on account of natural calamities such as flood cyclone etc. The loans were mostly for purchase of seed and other current farm expenditure in a few districts loan for consumption purposes were also reported. In some districts Government had advanced loans for digging and repair of wells with a view to alleviating distress due to water scarcity. According to the information available with us in 1950-1 in West Godavari Government disbursed about Rs 50 lakh. under the Cyclone Relief scheme to be given as interest free loans to agriculturists who were hit by cyclone. Nearly Rs 30 lakhs out of the amount were disbursed for land improvement purposes while about Rs 8 lakh. Rs 7 lakh and Rs 4 lakhs were given for consumption purchase of livestock and repairs to houses respectively the rest was for agricultural purposes such as purchase of seed, manure fodder etc. It may be noted that several purposes for which normal Government loans would be made were in this case included in Cyclone Relief schemes. In Broach about Rs 1 000 were advanced during the year 1950-1 for relieving distress due to drought. In Jalpaiguri nearly two thirds of the total amount disbursed by Government during 1950-1 was advanced for relieving distress due to scarcity conditions resulting from flood. In Monohyr 97 per cent of the total amount sanctioned was sanctioned under the Agriculturists Loans Act. Due to large scale crop failure and consequent distress in this district the number of applications received under the Agriculturists Loans Act during 1950-1 was nearly ten times the number received in 1949-50. The table below gives the details regarding Government finance extended in the district during 1949-50 and 1950-1.

Monohyr District	Land Improvement Loans Act		Agriculturists Loans Act		Cash subsidies under G.M.F.	
	1949-50	1950-1	1949-50	1950-1	1949-50	1950-1
Number of applications received	75	312	0	6926	1534	
Number of applications sanctioned	216	29	322	563	1212	
Total amount of loan subsidies sanctioned (Rs)	153,315	49180	251461	1819414	224435	300,24

In some other districts also loans for relief of distress were reported to have been advanced by Government during the year 1950-1.

Subsidies

19 2 10 In 14 out of the 75 selected districts the subsidy given by Government in connexion with the Grow More Food campaign exceeded Rs 1 lakh. The table on next page sets out the total amount of subsidy and loans sanctioned in these districts during 1950-1. All the selected districts of Bihar except Palamau and the selected districts of Madras barring West Godavari and Ramanathapuram are among the 14 districts. The proportion of amount of subsidy to the total amount of loans and subsidy varies over a wide range in the different districts. In Cachar where

(Amount in lakhs of rupees)

Serial number	District	Coverage of data	Subsidy sanctioned during 1950-1	Amount of loans sanctioned during 1950-1	Subsidy sanctioned as percentage of total amount of loans and subsidy sanctioned
1	Cachar	District	1 2 ⁰	14 98	7 5
2	Bhagalpur		5 14	18 06	21 6
3	Monghyr		3 55	18 69	16 0
4	Hazaribagh		1 92	2 57	42 8
5	Balla		1 94	3 27	37 2
6	Sitapur		1 02	5 61	15 4
7	Meerut		6 12	5 40	53 1
8	Bhatinda		2 56	4 23	37 7
9	Amritabad		2 72	10 64	20 3
10	Cumtatore		2 01	12 89	13 4
11	Cuddajah	6 talukas District	2 08	3 36	38 2
12	Kurnool ¹		1 67	0 67	71 5
13	Chingleput		3 37	13 98	19 4
14	Malabar		1 17	2 07	36 2

¹ Excluding data relating to Nandyal taluka and Banganapali sub taluka

rehabilitation finance was important it was the lowest at about 8 per cent. In Kurnool and Meerut the subsidy exceeded the amount of loans sanctioned. Generally the subsidy was granted for digging and repair of wells in these districts.

Borrowings from and debt owed to Government

19 2 11 We shall now proceed to analyse the data relating to borrowings from and debt owed to Government by the cultivating and non-cultivating families covered by the General Schedule. All the families in the selected villages covered by the General Schedule had given information relating to borrowings from Government during the period of one year preceding the month of interview and the debt owed to Government as on the date of interview. We have already discussed in Chapter 18 based on these data the comparative role played by Government in the provision of agricultural credit. We discuss here some further details regarding these data. In table 19 4 the districts are arranged in descending order of the average size of borrowings from Government per cultivating family. The table also presents the data on the proportion of cultivating families borrowing from Government and the average amount borrowed from Government per family borrowing from Government. Borrowing from Government was reported by cultivators in 67 of the selected districts. In all except 19 of these the average size of borrowings from Government per cultivating family was less than Rs 10. In 26 of the districts borrowings from Government averaged less than Rs 2 per cultivating family.

19 2 12 The five districts in which the average borrowing from Government per cultivating family was the highest are Sagar, Hoshiarpur, Tripura, Bhilsa and Ahmedabad. In Sagar where the average borrowing from Government per cultivating family was Rs 119 40 per cent of the borrowing cultivating families reported borrowing from Government and 23 per cent of the total borrowings of cultivators was from Government. In this district 78 per cent of the total amount sanctioned

TABLE 194—BORROWINGS FROM GOVERNMENT: CULTIVATORS

Serial number	District	Average borrowings from Government per family	Proportion of families borrowing from Government to the total number of families	Proportion of families borrowing from Government to the total number of borrowings families	Average borrowing from Government per family borrowing from Government
		(Pcs)	(Per cent)	(Per cent)	(Pcs)
		1	2	3	4
1	Sagar	119	31.3	40.2	34.5
2	Hosharpur	85	16.8	24.6	32.1
3	Tripura	56	16.1	37.1	33.2
4	Bhilsa	49	7.3	3.1	2 (8.1)
5	Ahmedabad	37	15.6	27.3	234
6	Chingleput	36	3.4	4.4	1 (8.4)
7	Shivpuri	27	4.9	15.1	443
8	Poona	22	5.7	20.4	387
9	Muzapur	21	25.9	33.9	80
10	Chanda	13	9.4	14.6	136
11	Nagpur	13	9.1	15.9	143
12	Sorath	13	4.1	6.6	322
13	Jhabua	12	9.7	11.7	122
14	Cuddapah	12	3.0	4.2	380
15	West Godavari	12	2.8	3.6	456
16	Bhagalpur	11	28.4	39.9	40
17	Kamrup	10	3.8	6.5	253
18	Monghyr	10	6.9	11.0	149
19	Ramanathapuram	10	10.7	16.6	94
20	West Khandesh	9	2.3	5.6	387
21	Cachar	8	1.6	3.6	459
22	Sawai Madhopur	7	0.6	0.9	1,230
23	Durg	7	14.0	27.2	46
24	Burdwan	6	2.1	4.3	291
25	Hazaribagh	6	13.0	26.9	42
26	Jullundur	6	1.3	2.7	496
27	Mahbubnagar	5	0.4	0.5	1,217
28	Nainital	4	0.4	0.7	942
29	Osmanabad	4	1.3	2.8	327
30	Shajapur	3	0.2	0.3	1,454
31	Parbhani	3	4.6	8.3	56
32	Nizamabad	3	1.3	2.7	260
33	Malda	2	0.6	1.1	252
34	Balia	2	1.6	2.6	134
35	Shahjahanpur	2	0.1	0.1	3,375
36	Agra	2	0.2	0.4	622
37	Bhatinda	2	0.4	0.8	302

TABLE 194—BORROWINGS FROM GOVERNMENT CULTIVATORS
—Concluded

Serial number	District	Average borrowings from government family	Percentage of family from government family	Percentage of family from government family	Average borrowings from government family
		(P)	(P)	(P)	(P)
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
38	Bhadrachalam	2	11	20	186
39	Bhadrachalam	2	12	18	141
40	Bhadrachalam	2	0	04	79
41	Chittoor	2	00	10	36
42	Jalapa	1	05	08	20
43	Mandya	1	08	13	116
44	Madhav	1	8	39	49
45	Madhav	1	04	06	14
46	Madhav	1	13	30	66
47	Madhav	1	01	05	4
48	Madhav	1	02	06	286
49	Madhav	1	06	11	203
50	Madhav	1	11	28	27
51	Madhav	1	14	28	5
52	Madhav	1	13	34	79
53	Madhav	1	05	18	106
54	Madhav	1	02	04	40
55	Madhav	1	09	11	100
56	Madhav	1	04	05	68
57	Madhav	1	04	05	667
58	Madhav	1	01	02	133
59	Madhav	1	04	07	87
60	Madhav	1	02	05	93
61	Madhav	1	04	07	87
62	Madhav	1	04	07	87
63	Madhav	1	04	07	87
64	Madhav	1	04	07	87
65	Madhav	1	04	07	87
66	Madhav	1	04	07	87
67	Madhav	1	04	07	87
68	Madhav	1	04	07	87
69	Madhav	1	04	07	87
70	Madhav	1	04	07	87
71	Madhav	1	04	07	87
72	Madhav	1	04	07	87
73	Madhav	1	04	07	87
74	Madhav	1	04	07	87
75	Madhav	1	04	07	87

during 1950-1 was sanctioned under the Grow More Food campaign. Out of Rs 23 lakhs reported to have been advanced as loans by Government in the district as a whole Rs 7.4 lakhs were for tractor ploughing representing presumably the due to be recovered by Government from the agriculturists whose lands had been ploughed by Government tractors. Slightly over Rs 3 lakh were advanced for purchase of implements and machinery. In this district 40 per cent of the borrowing cultivating families reported borrowing from Government. 47 per cent of the indebted cultivating families reported that they were indebted to Government on the date of interview.

19.2.13 In Hosharpur where the average size of borrowing from Government was Rs 88 per family and 25 per cent of the borrowing cultivating families borrowed from Government 90 per cent of the total advances had been given under the schemes for the rehabilitation of displaced persons. In Tripura, it was chiefly one village which pulled up the district average. In this case loans were advanced by Government under the Takavi Loan Regulations (Act I of 1910 T.E.). In Bhilsa, where the average size of borrowing was Rs 49 per cultivating family only 3 per cent of the borrowing cultivating families reported borrowing from Government. In several parts of Madhya Bharat the Central Tractor Organization was reclaiming weed-infested lands. In Ahmedabad where 28 per cent of the borrowing cultivating families reported borrowing from Government loans chiefly for well-digging and other land improvements had been given.

19.2.14 Among the districts other than those mentioned above the proportion of cultivating families borrowing from Government to the total number of borrowing cultivating families was as high as 34 per cent in Mirzapur, 31 per cent in Bhagalpur and 27 per cent in Durg and Hazaribagh. In Poona, Shivajinagar, Wazirpur, Chanda and Ramanathapuram about 15 to 20 per cent of the borrowing cultivating families reported borrowing from Government, in all these districts the average borrowing from Government was Rs 10 or more per cultivating family. Incidentally, it may be noted that these are generally the districts in which lendings during the year by Government were relatively large.

19.2.15 The data relating to debt owed to Government by cultivators, non-cultivators and all families are given in table 19.5. The average debt owed to Government per cultivating family exceeded Rs 100 in only three districts viz. Sagar, Ahmedabad and Tripura where it was Rs 207, Rs 125 and Rs 119 respectively. In Sagar 42 per cent of the indebted cultivating families were indebted to Government. Cultivating families indebted to Government were found in six of the eight selected villages in this district: in one of these villages two-thirds of the cultivating families and in another more than 80 per cent of the cultivating families were indebted to Government. The debt owed to Government formed 36 per cent of the total debt of cultivating families in Sagar. As was seen before, reclamation work was being carried out through the Central Tractor Organization in the district, large number of loans for purchase of tractors, implements etc. was also given in this district by Government. According to the intensive enquiry data in this

TABLE 195—DEBT OWED TO GOVERNMENT

State District	CULTIVATORS			NON-CULTIVATORS			ALL FAMILIES		
	Average debt owed to Government in 1937-38 (Rs.)	Proportion of families indebted to Government in 1937-38 (Per cent)	Average debt owed to Government in 1937-38 (Rs.)	Average debt owed to Government in 1937-38 (Rs.)	Proportion of families indebted to Government in 1937-38 (Per cent)	Average debt owed to Government in 1937-38 (Rs.)	Proportion of families indebted to Government in 1937-38 (Per cent)	Average debt owed to Government in 1937-38 (Rs.)	
	(Rs.)	(Per cent)	(Rs.)	(Rs.)	(Per cent)	(Rs.)	(Per cent)	(Rs.)	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Assam									
Lakimpur									
Cachar	13	30	636	27	88	573	17	43	
Kamrup	45	288	187	10	79	109	35	240	
Tripura									
Tripura	110	481	434	11	192	317	89	451	
West Bengal									
Jalpaiguri	1	02	1113	5	54	523	2	04	
Malda	5	30	288		03	17	2	18	
Burdwan	49	105	640	63	182	590	55	135	
Medinipur	1	19	93		19	21	1	10	
Bihar									
Bhagalpur	13	298	49		12	43	10	226	
Monghyr	21	134	191	1	10	149	11	80	
Hazaribagh	5	174	43	1	53	61	6	158	
Palamou	1	39	50		01	50	1	31	
Uttar Pradesh									
Muzaffarpur	25	350	94				17	292	
Ballia	3	05	159				2	17	
Deoria	1	04	208	5	16	630	1	05	
Jaunpur		05	74	1	12	163		07	
Bulandshahr	1	03	217		02	200	1	03	
Mathura			40					400	
Kanpur		02	357		01	700	-	02	
Hamirpur			10					100	
Bhawalpur	5	06	1421		04	100	4	06	
Agra	2	05	181				1	04	
Aligarh	1	07	13					35	
Mathura	3	06	786	3	06	880	3	05	
Meerut	1	11	165				1	07	
Himachal Pradesh									
Srinagar									
Punjab									
Hoshiarpur	55	213	329	1	01	400	30	135	
Jullundur	26	121	347	6	57	184	11	71	
Hoshiarpur	1	22	10	6	12	139	3	48	
PEPSU									
Batala	5	12	79	7	09	1035	6	11	
Mohandragiri								88	
Rajasthan									
Churu	-	03	170					03	
Bharmer	2	16	219					15	
Sikoli		01	100					01	
Jaipur			70					70	
Bikaner	3	05	746		15	19	3	06	
Chittorgarh	3	20	183		01	3	2	16	

TABLE 19.5—DEBT OWED TO GOVERNMENT—Concluded

State District	CULTIVATORS			NON-CULTIVATORS			ALL FAMILIES		
	Average debt owed to Government per family	Proportion of fams has been delted to Government to total number of indebted fams has been delted to Government	Average debt owed to Government per family indebted to Government	Average debt owed to Government per family	Proportion of fams has been delted to Government to total number of indebted fams has been delted to Government	Average debt owed to Government per family	Average debt owed to Government per family	Proportion of fams has been delted to Government to total number of indebted fams has been delted to Government	Average debt owed to Government per family indebted to Government
	(Pcs)	(Per cent)	(Pcs)	(Pcs)	(Per cent)	(Pcs)	(Rs)	(Per cent)	(Pcs)
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Madhya Bharat									
Jhabua	8	9.4	106	-	3.3	20	8	9.4	106
Shirpur	26	11.3	30.9	-	-	-	22	10.2	35.2
Shajapur	7	0.3	3.5	-	-	-	5	0.9	3.5
Bhilsa	70	3.5	17.3	-	0.9	60	29	2.5	1,533
Bhopal									
Raisen	7	5.3	239	7	5.2	307	7	5.3	264
Vindhya Pradesh									
Satna	-	-	600	-	-	-	-	-	600
Pewa	2	1.9	191	-	-	-	1	1.4	191
Orissa									
Sambalpur	11	13.3	129	-	0.4	58	7	9.4	178
Puri	3	1.7	215	1	1.0	65	2	1.7	169
Koraput	6	1.6	92	-	-	900	2	10.3	92
Madhya Pradesh									
Bilaspur	1	2.7	70	-	0.5	30	1	2.6	69
Durg	6	28.3	46	-	-	-	5	27.8	46
Chanda	23	19.0	165	1	3.3	69	13	11.1	178
Nagpur	37	3.2	172	13	0.7	9,000	25	27.6	228
Sagar	20	4.1	545	12	5.3	523	15	36.2	544
Aloda	2	4.4	107	1	4.2	100	1	4.3	105
Saurashtra									
Sorath	21	8.2	410	20	4.8	829	21	7.5	484
Bombay									
Ahmedabad	125	53.8	300	6	4.8	255	70	36.9	295
Broach	4	27.0	267	4	9.6	135	32	23.0	250
West Khandesh	58	4.8	249	-	1.0	100	35	37.3	216
Poona	55	28.1	329	4	4.2	295	38	27.3	328
Palnagun	6	4.4	257	-	-	-	-	3.6	257
Kolhapur	-	0.4	167	-	-	-	5	0.6	167
Bijapur	19	11.3	268	3	2.9	183	14	2.2	260
Hyderabad									
Osmanabad	5	2.4	320	-	0.3	150	3	1.5	355
Parbhani	1	0.8	142	13	1.7	2873	7	1.2	167
Nizamabad	18	5.6	45	-	0.6	20	15	4.9	47
Mahbubnagar	8	0.8	1165	-	0.9	84	5	0.8	249
Mysore									
Hassan	-	0.2	138	16	0.7	6100	4	0.3	1764
Bangalore	-	0.1	300	-	-	-	-	0.1	300
Madras									
Coimbatore	19	5.4	462	-	0.2	117	8	2.9	450
Cuddapah	13	4.0	475	-	0.1	166	11	3.2	369
Kurnool	2	1.1	175	3	0.3	1,267	2	0.9	263
West Godavari	13	3.2	469	1	0.2	322	6	1.8	460
Chingleput	57	6.3	990	1	0.7	183	37	4.5	923
Tammarathapuram	11	14.1	85	-	0.4	100	9	12.3	85
Malabar	1	0.4	264	-	-	-	1	0.3	264
Travancore-Cochin									
Quilon	-	0.2	58	-	-	-	-	0.2	58

district about 33 per cent of the debt owed to Government was reported to be for short term consumption purposes. In Ahmedabad 51 per cent of the indebted cultivating families were indebted to Government. Debt owed to Government constituted 15.6 per cent of the total debt owed by cultivators in the district. It will be seen later that 42.5 per cent of the debt owed to Government by the selected cultivators of the district was for long term agricultural purposes and 57.5 per cent for short term agricultural purposes. In this district during 1949-50 Government advanced loans amounting to Rs 98 lakhs of which Rs 21 lakhs were for well-digging and other irrigation projects and another Rs 21 lakhs for purchase of livestock, for purchase of seed and fodder loans to the extent of Rs 34 lakhs were advanced during the year. In Tripura 48 per cent of the indebted cultivating families were indebted to Government and the debt owed to Government constituted 53.9 per cent of their total debt. In one of the selected villages of the district all the cultivating families were indebted to Government. In another selected village 98 out of the 235 cultivating families were indebted to Government.

19.2.16 West Khandesh Broach Poona Hosharpur and Chingleput are the other districts in which the average debt owed to Government by cultivating families was relatively high. As already noted these are generally the districts in which the average borrowing from Government was relatively high. In Chingleput where the average debt owed to Government per cultivating family was Rs 57 only 6 per cent of the indebted families were indebted to Government. In the other districts the proportion of indebted families indebted to Government was more than 20 per cent. It will be seen later that according to the intensive enquiry data in Broach and Hosharpur the debt owed to Government was outstanding largely on loans contracted for consumption purposes—short term consumption purposes in the former district and long term consumption purposes in the latter. In Broach as already noted a substantial proportion of the Government advances of the year 1950-1 was for relief of distress and in Hosharpur for rehabilitation of displaced persons.

Purposes for which Government finance was obtained

19.2.17 We shall now consider the purposes for which rural families obtained loans from Government. Data relating to purposes of borrowing were collected in the *General Schedule*. In the schedule however we did not collect information regarding the purposes for which the debt outstanding as on the date of visit was contracted. Thus while the purposes of borrowing from Government can be considered in respect of all families the purposes for which debt owed to Government was originally incurred can be studied only in respect of the selected cultivating families covered by the intensive enquiry. The average borrowing from Government for different purposes as well as the proportion of borrowings from Government to the total borrowings from all agencies for the purposes in respect of all families are given in table 19.6.

19.2.18 It will be seen from table 19.6 that of the 75 selected districts rural families reported borrowings from Government for capital expenditure in 61 districts,

TABLE 196—AVERAGE BORROWING FROM GOVERNMENT FOR
FROM GOVERNMENT TO THE TOTAL BORROWINGS

State District	TOTAL		CAPITAL EXPENDITURE ON FARM		CURRENT EXPENDITURE ON FARM	
	Average	Proportion	Average	Proportion	Average	Proportion
	(Rs)	(Per cent)	(Rs)	(Per cent)	(P ^{cs})	(Per cent)
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Assam						
Lakhimpur			—			—
Cachar	9 0	10 2	6 7	23 4	0 4	71 3
Kamrup	8 0	5 6	2 0	6 0	—	0 5
Tripura						
Tripura	43 5	41 2	42 6	79 4	—	—
West Bengal						
Jalpaiguri	1 3	1 6	0 3	5 2	—	2 9
Malda	0 8	0 7	0 3	1 4	—	—
Burdwan	4 9	5 1	0 2	2 0	—	—
Midnapore	0 7	0 7	0 3	1 6	—	2 3
Bihar						
Bhagalpur	8 3	3 5	2 1	5 0	5 6	13 3
Monghyr	5 8	3 9	2 4	8 8	—	6 7
Hazaribagh	4 7	9 2	0 7	6 1	3 8	45 7
Palamau	1 1	1 0	0 2	0 9	0 6	2 7
Uttar Pradesh						
Muzaffarpur	14 2	14 7	—	0 2	14 1	36 4
Ballia	1 6	1 5	1 3	9 9	0 3	3 0
Deoria	0 3	0 1	—	0 1	0 1	0 2
Jaunpur	0 5	0 3	—	—	0 1	0 8
Sultanpur	—	—	—	0 1	—	—
Sitapur	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kanpur	0 2	0 1	—	0 1	—	1 7
Hamirpur	0 2	0 2	0 1	0 2	—	—
Shahjahanpur	1 4	0 6	1 3	2 0	—	0 1
Agra	1 5	0 6	1 1	1 2	—	—
Aligarh	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nainital	2 0	0 3	1 8	3 0	0 2	4 8
Meerut	0 2	0 1	—	—	0 1	7 7
Himachal Pradesh						
Sirmoor	0 7	0 7	—	—	0 3	5 7
Punjab						
Hoshiarpur	50 1	24 9	46 4	57 4	—	—
Jullundur	2 5	1 8	1 1	3 6	—	—
Hissar	0 7	0 6	0 4	1 6	—	—
PEPSU						
Bhatinda	1 1	0 3	0 6	0 9	0 2	5 5
Mohindergarh	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rajasthan						
Churu	—	—	—	—	—	—
Barmer	0 6	0 2	—	—	—	—
Sirohi	—	0 2	—	0 5	—	—
Jaipur	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sawai Madhopur	5 8	1 9	2 8	2 7	—	—
Chittorgarh	0 3	0 2	0 3	0 4	—	—

EACH PURPOSE AND THE PROPORTION OF BORROWINGS FROM ALL CREDIT AGENCIES FOR EACH PURPOSE ALL FAMILIES

State District	NON FARM BUSINESS EXPENDITURE		FAMILY EXPENDITURE		OTHER EXPENDITURE	
	Average	Proportion	Average	Proportion	Average	Proportion
	(Rs)	(Per cent)	(Rs)	(Per cent)	(Ps)	(Per cent)
		8	9	10	11	1
Assam						
Lakhimpur			1 9	3 5		
Cachar			0 8	1 0		
Kamrup	5 2	20 4				
Tripura						
Trirupura			0 5	1 3	0 3	8 0
West Bengal						
Jalpaiguri	0 1	20 2	0 8	1 2		
Malda			0	0 8		
Burdwan	3 1	66 9	1 6	2 1		
Medinipur			0 3	0 4	0 1	2 5
Bihar						
Bhagalpur			0 7	0 5		
Monghyr			3 0	2 9	0 4	2 2
Hazaribagh			0 1	0 4	0 1	9 6
Palamau	0 1	0 5	0 2	0 5		
Uttar Pradesh						
Muzaffarpur			0 1	0 2		
Balua						
Deoria	0 1	1 4	0 1	0 1		
Jaunpur			0 4	0 5		
Sultanpur				0 1		
Satapur						
Kanpur	0 1	1 0				
Hamirpur			0 1	0 1		
Shahjahanpur						
Agra			0 4	0 3		
Aligarh				0 1		
Nanatal						
Meerut			0 1			
Himachal Pradesh						
Sirmoor					0 4	3 3
Punjab						
Hoshiarpur			3 8	3 2		
Jullundur	0 1	0 5	1 3	1 5		
Hissar	0 3	6 3				
PEPSU						
Bhatinda			0 2	0 1		
Mohandragh						-
Rajasthan						
Churu						
Barmer			0 6	0 4		
Bikaner						
Jaipur						
Sawai Madhopur			3 0	2 2		
Chittorgarh						

TABLE 19.6—AVERAGE BORROWING FROM GOVERNMENT FOR GOVERNMENT TO THE TOTAL BORROWINGS FROM ALL

State/District	TOTAL		CAPITAL EXPENDITURE ON FARM		CURRENT FARM EXPENDITURE	
	Average	Proportion	Average	Proportion	Average	Proportion
	(Rs)	(Per cent)	(Rs)	(Per cent)	(Rs)	(Per cent)
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Madhya Bharat						
Jhabua	11.3	9.7	10.2	49.5	0.4	6.0
Shivpur	18.1	22.1	18.1	58.6	-	-
Shajapur	1.9	0.7	1.9	3.6	-	-
Bhilsa	28.5	10.6	28.5	22.8	-	-
Bhopal						
Raisen	0.7	0.6	0.7	1.6	-	-
Vindhya Pradesh						
Satna	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	-	-
Rewa	1.2	1.5	1.1	4.4	0.1	1.4
Orissa						
Sambalpur	0.3	0.5	0.3	1.4	-	100.0
Puri	1.2	1.3	0.5	1.7	-	-
Koraput	-	-	-	-	-	-
Madhya Pradesh						
Bilaspur	0.7	0.9	-	0.2	0.6	10.9
Durg	5.3	9.7	0.1	0.6	4.9	60.5
Chanda	7.4	6.7	4.9	22.1	2.4	17.3
Nagpur	6.9	5.8	5.6	13.7	1.2	6.5
Sagar	86.6	22.6	49.5	52.0	23.5	42.3
Akola	0.7	0.8	0.5	5.2	0.2	0.5
Saurashtra						
Sorath	15.2	7.3	15.0	33.3	-	0.5
Bombay						
Ahmedabad	20.0	8.6	19.4	18.8	0.6	2.5
Broach	1.2	0.6	0.3	0.7	-	-
West Khandesh	5.3	3.1	4.7	8.8	0.6	1.2
Poona	14.7	10.4	13.2	22.8	0.7	1.5
Ratnagiri	0.4	1.0	0.3	2.8	-	11.3
Kolhapur	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.6	0.1	0.8
Bijapur	0.7	0.4	0.7	1.2	-	0.2
Hyderabad						
Osmanabad	2.4	1.7	1.1	4.3	1.3	11.7
Parbhani	7.5	6.9	6.1	23.2	1.4	5.2
Nizamabad	2.8	1.8	0.4	0.6	2.3	10.0
Mahbubnagar	3.0	1.5	2.9	4.2	-	-
Mysore						
Hassan	-	-	-	0.1	-	0.6
Bangalore	-	-	-	-	-	-
Madras						
Coimbatore	0.8	0.3	0.6	0.7	0.1	0.5
Cuddapah	9.0	2.4	6.5	7.3	1.7	2.3
Kurnool	0.7	0.2	-	-	0.6	1.2
West Godavari	6.2	1.7	1.3	1.3	1.2	2.3
Chingleput	23.7	10.3	22.4	19.3	0.6	3.1
Ramanathapuram	8.4	6.3	-	-	7.4	20.5
Malabar	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1
Travancore Cochin						
Quilon	0.1	-	-	-	-	0.2

EACH PURPOSE AND THE PROPORTION OF BORROWINGS FROM CREDIT AGENCIES FOR EACH PURPOSE ALL FAMILIES—Concluded

State I t r t	N N F A R E X T E N D T R E		P A I L E X P E N D I T U R E		T E R E X P E N D T R E	
	A r e a	L o g t o n	A r e a	L o g t o n	A r e a	P r o p t o n
	(R s) 7	(P e r c e n t) 8	(R s) 9	(P e r c e n t) 10	(R s) 11	(P e r c e n t) 12
Madhya Bharat						
Jhabua			17	0.5		0.4
Shajapur						-
Bhopal						
Raisen						
Vindhya Pradesh						
Satna						0.4
Rewa						
Orissa						
Sambalpur						
Koraput	0.1	3.3	5	0.9	0.1	7
Madhya Pradesh						
Bilaspur		11.4				0.3
Durg			0.3	1.0		
Chand			0.1	0.2		
Nagpur		0.9	1	0		0.3
Sagar			13.0	13.5		
Akola						
Saurashtra						
Surat	0.1	0.4				
Bombay						
Ahmednagar			1.0	1.1		
Pune			0.4	0.1		
Warananasi				1.6	0.6	4.7
Poona						
Ratnagiri						
Belgaum						
Hyderabad						
Osmanabad				0.1		
Ellichpur			0.1	0.1		
Nizamabad			1	0.1		
Malakpet						
Mysore						
Hassan						
Madras						
Chennai			1.8	0.4		
Cuddalore	0.1	0.4				
Tamil Nadu			3.1	0.6	0.6	3.3
West Bengal			0.3	0.4	0.4	3.4
Chennai			1.0	1.0		
Malabar						
Travancore Cochin						
Quilon		0.1	-			

borrowings for current farm expenditure in 46 districts, for non farm business expenditure in 14 districts and for family expenditure in 51 districts. Even though borrowings from Government for capital expenditure on farm were reported in the largest number of districts borrowings from Government for this purpose constituted more than 25 per cent of the total borrowings for the purpose in only six districts, viz, Tripura, Shivpuri, Hoshiarpur, Sagar, Jhabua and Sorath. In Tripura, borrowings from Government were largely for reclamation of land. In all the other districts purchase of livestock was an important purpose for which borrowing from Government was resorted to. Digging and repair of wells was generally the other important purpose of borrowing from Government. In Sagar district, borrowing from Government for bunding and other land improvements was more important than for digging and repair of wells.

19.2.19 In the following table we present data on borrowings from Government in the ten districts in which the proportion of borrowings for capital expenditure on farm from Government to the total borrowings for the purpose was the highest.

Serial number	District	Average borrowing from Government for capital expenditure on farm per family	Borrowings from Government for capital expenditure on farm as percent age of total borrowings from Government	Borrowings from Government for capital expenditure on farm as percent age of total borrowings for the purpose
		(Rs)		
1	Tripura	42.6	98.0	79.4
2	Shivpuri	18.1	99.9	58.5
3	Hoshiarpur	46.4	92.5	57.4
4	Sagar	49.5	57.3	52.0
5	Jhabua	10.2	90.2	49.5
6	Sorath	15.0	99.2	33.3
7	Cachar	6.7	74.7	23.4
8	Parbhani	6.1	81.8	23.2
9	Bhilsa	28.5	100.0	21.8
10	Poona	13.2	89.5	22.8

In all these districts except Sagar, about 75 per cent or more of the total borrowings from Government was for capital expenditure on farm. In Sagar the proportion of borrowings from Government for capital expenditure on farm to the total borrowings from the agency was only 57 per cent. In this district, as will be seen later, current farm expenditure was also an important purpose of borrowing from Government.

19.2.20 The table on next page presents the data relating to borrowings from Government in the ten districts in which the proportion of borrowings for current farm expenditure from Government to the total borrowings for the purpose was the highest. In six of the districts viz, Sambalpur, Cachar, Durg, Hazaribagh, Sagar and Murzapur, more than 30 per cent of the total borrowings for current farm expenditure were from Government, the proportion being more than 60 per cent in Sambalpur, Cachar and Durg, the average borrowing per family for this purpose was, however, very low in all the three districts. In Sagar, Murzapur and Ramanathapuram, advances from Government for current farm purposes were relatively large.